

The History Teacher's Magazine

EDITED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Volume VII.
Number 6.

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1916.

\$2.00 a year.
20 cents a copy.

CONTENTS

The History of the Far East, by Prof. K. S. Latourette	-	-	-	181
The Purchase of Louisiana, by Prof. F. H. Hodder	-	-	-	185
A Canadian Port in War Time, by B. H. Nye	-	-	-	189
Definition of the Field of Secondary School History:				
I. Papers Read at the Washington Meeting				
By Prof. H. D. Foster	-	-	-	191
By Prof. H. E. Bourne	-	-	-	194
By Margaret McGill	-	-	-	196
By Prof. E. M. Violette	-	-	-	197
By Dr. James Sullivan	-	-	-	199
II. Papers Read at the Berkeley Meeting				
By Prof. G. L. Burr	-	-	-	201
By Crystal Harford	-	-	-	202
By E. J. Berringer	-	-	-	203
By J. R. Sutton	-	-	-	207
Periodical Literature, by Dr. G. B. Richards	-	-	-	210
Reports from the Historical Field	-	-	-	211
Book Reviews, edited by Prof. W. J. Chase	-	-	-	217
Recent Historical Publications, listed by Dr. C. A. Coulomb	-	-	-	219

Published monthly, except July and August, by McKinley Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1916, McKinley Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter, Oct. 26, 1909, at Post-office at Phila., Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879

*An Event of
Importance*



Ancient Times

By JAMES H. BREASTED, University of Chicago

It gives us great satisfaction to announce the publication at an early date of Breasted's *Ancient Times*.

The author is an authority on ancient history, of international reputation. He unites with his profound erudition a lucid style and a thorough knowledge of high-school needs, as all who know his work can testify.

The book is unapproached in beauty of form. The illustrations are profuse in number and of the highest quality.

If you want complete information about it, won't you send us a postal?

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston
Atlanta

New York
Dallas

Chicago
Columbus

London
San Francisco

Unexcelled for Ancient History Classes

Morey's Ancient Peoples

By WILLIAM C. MOREY, Ph.D., D.C.L., Professor of History and Political Science, University of Rochester. 640 pages, with maps and illustrations. \$1.50.

A clearly written, typographically attractive book for high-school pupils. It connects the civilization of each people with the history of the nation itself, in order to show what it has contributed to the general improvement of mankind. One of the chief aims of the book is the cultivation of the *historical sense*.

Lewis's Oriental and Greek Peoples

Study Outline, 25 cents

McKinley's Roman People

Study Outline, 25 cents

These companion volumes are based on, and cover the period of *Morey's Ancient Peoples*. They help the pupil to understand the relations between cause and result, and to distinguish the landmarks of history from the minor details. They train him to co-ordinate and subordinate properly the various events and they insure a stated amount of thought and work in each day's assignment.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York Cincinnati Chicago Boston Atlanta

**Keep the History Student's Feet on the Ground
Help Him Locate Events of the Story**

MAPS

such as these make the subject more vivid, strengthen the historical impression and bring out geographical relationships and influences.

The Goode Series of Wall Maps. GOODE. *Rand McNally.*
The World, The Hemispheres, North America, Europe, Eurasia, Africa, United States, Australia and the Philippines.

The Foster Historical Maps. FOSTER. *Rand McNally.*
Covering Discovery, Exploration, and Colonization, Development, Campaigns, and Political Parties.

Chamberlin's Map of North America, During the Great Ice Age. CHAMBERLIN. *Rand McNally.*

True Literary Map of the British Isles. TRUE.
(Historical as well). *Rand McNally.*

Kiepert's Classical Maps. Kiepert.
Covering the whole ancient world, and different countries of the ancient world. Eight maps.

Historical Maps of Europe. Spruner-Bretschneider.
Ranging from 350 A.D. to and including the time of the Reformation. Ten maps.

Biblical Maps. *Rand McNally, and other Publishers.*
Covering the Holy Land and all countries of the Bible.

History teachers are particularly enthusiastic over the new Goode Maps. Send for special descriptive matter.

RAND McNALLY & COMPANY

CHICAGO : NEW YORK

BE SURE TO INSPECT FREE SAMPLES OF

McKINLEY'S

Illustrated Topics for Ancient and American History

These topics comprise a comprehensive notebook system, including a durable, low-priced cover with patent rings; and loose leaf pages containing analysis, references for topical reading, source studies, outline maps, and a very valuable collection of historical pictures. Teachers who have adopted the topics state that their use has organized the class work, has enlivened the study of history and awakened a deeper interest on the part of students.

Any teacher who has not inspected sample copies of these topics should write at once to the publishers

McKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The History Teacher's Magazine

Volume VII.
Number 6.

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1916.

\$2.00 a year.
20 cents a copy.

The History of the Far East, A Neglected Field

BY PROFESSOR K. S. LATOURETTE, REED COLLEGE, PORTLAND, OREGON.

Not long ago the name Burmah came up in a conversation. "Burmah," said a gentleman, "the people there speak Chinese, do they not? Where is Burmah anyway?" Then followed other questions which showed the same profound ignorance of the Far East. This gentleman is a graduate of one of our oldest state universities and of one of our best medical schools. He has had several post graduate courses, among them one in Europe. He is the leading practitioner in one of our smaller cities of the Pacific Coast, and has no hesitation in expressing an opinion on all public questions, including our relations with Japan and China. And he is but typical of the majority of our educated Americans. For the average American of intelligence the chief sources of information on the Far East are the headlines of his morning paper. At best he may occasionally have read articles in our weeklies or monthlies, articles which are usually the expressions of passing travellers. His knowledge of the geography of those regions is of the most vague and general description. On the history, civilization, ideals, and problems of those great peoples his ideas, if he has any, are vague and grotesque in the extreme. His attitude toward Orientals is one of contemptuous, unreasoning prejudice. He judges the Chinese people by a few laundrymen or gardeners whom he has seen, as one-sided an estimate as though foreigners were to base their opinions of Americans on a scant acquaintance with a few Cape Cod fishermen. His knowledge of the Japanese is apt to be based largely on the garbled accounts of a yellow press.

This ignorance might have been excusable seventy-five years ago, when our relations with the Far East were confined to a relatively small commerce with one Chinese port. To-day it is no longer pardonable, nor even amusing. It is stupid. To-morrow it may be disastrous. Our relations with the nations on the other side of the Pacific have become intimate in the past few decades, and they must inevitably become more so as the years pass. The possession of the Philippines alone ties us up for better or for worse with the East of Asia. Hawaii at the cross roads of the Pacific is another link in the chain. From the first, one of the motives that led Americans westward to the Pacific was the desire for a share in the commerce of the East. To-day that desire is beginning to have its fruition. In 1914 six dollars out of every hundred of our foreign trade were with China and Japan, and the proportion seems destined

to increase with each decade. Immigration from China and Japan has already become a real problem, and with the increasing population of these countries and with their growing national consciousness it seems destined to be even more pressing. We have already exported capital to the Far East in the form of loans to the government and to industrial enterprises, and we probably are to export far more in the next generation. Our already important missionary and philanthropic interests are growing, especially in China. In that country over two thousand American missionaries are at work. The number has doubled since 1900 and may be doubled again within a decade. Nearly one thousand Chinese students are studying in our colleges and universities. At the outbreak of the war this was more than in all Europe. One result of the war has been largely to increase their relative number. Their influence in the future culture of China will be immeasurable. Our diplomatic relations and responsibilities in China and Japan are increasing. We took part in the suppression of the Boxer uprising and have stood sponsor for the doctrine of the open door. The Treaty of Portsmouth is a monument to decisive mediation.

At our very doors, then, is the Far East. We cannot avoid relations with it if we would. Its presence means grave danger and great opportunity. If we are to escape the one and seize the other, we must as Americans have more interest and more intelligent interest in the situation. One complaint of those Americans who are so ably and so nobly grappling with the problems of the Philippines is that we have not a fair idea of the situation in the Islands nor of the relations with the rest of Asia in which they have involved us. How can we hope to gain a fair share of the commerce of China and Japan if we do not know the needs of the market, the likes and dislikes of the people, or if we cannot speak their language and approach them on their own ground? The South American market is teaching us that our merchants must know something of the history, the institutions, the culture and the language of a people with whom we hope to do business. The success of the German and the Japanese methods of commercial education is written unmistakably in their trade statistics. We cannot hope to have anything but trouble over the question of immigration until we have become more intelligent. If we knew more of the historical, cultural and economic background of the Japanese and Chinese, we would be more ap-

preciative of their representatives now in our midst, and would have less friction in settling the question of how many more are to be admitted. We can never adequately mobilize our Christian forces to help China in her period of transition while the mass of our church members know little more of her and her problems than they do of Timbuctu. How can we expect anything but abortive plans, friction, and failure in our diplomacy if our diplomats, frequently none too well informed to begin with, must be subject to the control of an apathetic, or an uninformed, blindly prejudiced public opinion? We have had, for instance, at least one public man who has vociferously prophesied an early war with Japan, thereby proclaiming his own ignorance and the ignorance of the audiences that have tolerated him. Such ignorance, if it continues, cannot but be disastrous. We cannot escape playing some part in the Far East, and that part will be anything but wise or glorious if we know no more than we do now of its peoples and its cultures, of its problems and its difficulties.

One is not surprised at our widespread ignorance, after he has examined the curricula of our educational institutions. Even in our Pacific Coast states a careful inquiry fails to show one high school that offers even an elective course on the Far East. Our text books on the history of the Nineteenth Century usually take up the question of the Far East in connection with the expansion of Europe. But in one of our most widely used manuals on medieval and modern history for secondary schools only thirteen pages out of a total of seven hundred and eight are devoted to China and Japan, and that is better than the average. Several entirely fail to mention them. Four of our principal texts on American history for secondary schools give out of a total of twenty-five hundred and ninety-one pages only five pages to our relations with China and Japan. Two entirely fail to mention them. The teacher is seldom especially trained to present the topic and at best the pupil escapes with a week or less devoted to gaining a series of general and imperfect impressions.

Nor is the situation in the colleges much better. An examination of the catalogues of two hundred and thirty-four institutions of higher learning gives some interesting results. These institutions include all the principal universities, and nearly all the leading colleges. In only twenty-five are courses offered specifically in the Far East. In four of these twenty-five it is taken up only from the standpoint of its relations to American diplomacy. In these four there is apparently no serious attempt to understand the peoples of these countries, their history, their culture, or their special problems. Only eight of the twenty-five offer more than a one-semester course to the Far East. Such one-semester courses in the crowded condition of our present day curricula represent perhaps all the time that we can expect the average student to give to the question and are certainly much better than nothing, but one semester is scarcely enough to give more than a general knowledge of peoples whose history and culture are so alien to our own. More

than eight institutions ought to offer courses in which the student who wishes it could get more than a general knowledge. The distribution of the twenty-five institutions is uneven. Seven of them, as might be expected, are in the Pacific Coast states. Only one of these is in Oregon, and that is a privately endowed institution that has about ten per cent. of the college student body of the state. Two are in the state institutions of Washington. The remaining four are in California, where Stanford and the State University each offer quite a choice of courses. One of the twenty-five is in the Rocky Mountain district, two are in the South, nine are in the North Atlantic States, only six are in the great district of the Middle West. Of these six three are small colleges. The three remaining, state universities, offer only a one-semester course each. One looks in vain for courses in such institutions as Chicago, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. Even in theological seminaries, supposed to be partly devoted to training men for foreign missionary service and leaders in missionary interest at home, one looks in vain, after a few notable and noble exceptions, for courses on the countries that present to the church of to-day some of its greatest problems.

In nearly all the colleges, courses on the history of the Nineteenth Century are offered, and some of these have something to say about the Far East. Three of the leading college texts on the period devote to the subject sixty pages out of a total eighteen hundred and sixty-six pages, or a little more than three per cent. of their space. This, of course, while it is better than nothing, can give only a most general discussion of these countries and must confine itself largely to recent events. At best it could only awaken in the student a desire to go further. Our American history courses as a rule do more poorly. For instance out of the seventeen volumes of the histories of the American Nation series that cover the years during which we have had relations with the Far East, not seventy-five pages are devoted to that field. In one of our latest and most widely advertised manuals on American history, the work of a prominent member of the history faculty of one of our most scholarly and progressive universities, Ningpo is located in Japan, and serious errors of fact are made in the brief mention of our relations with the Orient, errors which an adequate knowledge of our relations with Japan and China would enable one to detect instantly.

Moreover it is of interest to note that of these two hundred and thirty-four institutions, at least one hundred and fifteen offered courses in the history of Greece and Rome and of the Ancient Near East, seventy-five of which covered more than one semester. This is, of course, not without justification. The thread of our Occidental history and culture goes back through these countries. Have we not, however, failed to keep up with the times when we devote so much attention to these ancient cultures and neglect the study of those with which we are thrown in increasingly intimate contact? There seems to be

a distorted perspective in having, as does one distinguished American university, a well organized department on Semitics and in failing to offer to its thousands of students the opportunity of taking even an elementary course on the Far East.

The gaps left by the official curricula have been partially filled in other ways. There are occasional lectures given on the Far East. Our better periodicals now and then have articles on the current situation. Then the College Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations through voluntary classes on the study of foreign missions are helping to spread information. These courses labor under the handicap of being short—from six to twelve sessions is perhaps the average—and in being unable to insure regular attendance and adequate preparation, but they have courageously led the way and have been more progressive than the college curriculum.

Not only is there a serious gap in the courses of our secondary schools and our undergraduate departments, but there seems to be little tendency to train teachers to fill the gap. Of the three hundred and forty-nine doctoral dissertations in history listed as being in course of preparation in December, 1915, only six deal with China and Japan, and three with other countries of the Far East. Even if more desired graduate work in the history, language, and institutions of those countries they would have difficulty in getting it. In only three of our universities is instruction given in the Chinese or Japanese language. In these three enough work is offered in the history and institutions of these countries to make

possible graduate work. On the teaching force of these three there are only two of American birth and training. The rest are Japanese and Europeans. We have evidently not produced enough scholars on the Far Eastern question to man the faculties of even our graduate schools. So scanty has been the interest among American scholars that except in the meetings of its Pacific Coast branch and in its intercalary meeting at San Francisco last summer, the programs of the American Historical Association have practically ignored the field.

In the light of the importance of the field to Americans and of the lack of attention paid it, it would seem that a number of things should obviously be done. For the training of teachers and investigators, existing graduate departments should be enlarged and extended, and should be introduced in more universities. Undergraduate courses should be introduced in many more colleges and library facilities should be improved. We need better text books, text books written especially with such courses in mind. We need a journal devoted primarily to China and Japan. More extension lectures should be given by our colleges and universities to educate the public that is past the school going age. More attention should be paid to the Far East in our secondary school courses on commercial geography, the history of the nineteenth century, and current events. Elective courses should be offered in our larger high schools, especially on the Pacific Coast, and a special lecture or lectures should be planned for every high school. Our public must be educated, and we must look to our educational system to do it.

The Purchase of Louisiana

BY PROFESSOR FRANK HEYWOOD HODDER, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

I have been asked by the editor of THE HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE to contribute an article on the expansion of the United States, but have elected to limit myself to the first step in that expansion—the purchase of Louisiana. One difficulty in teaching the larger topics of American history in the secondary school results from the small amount of space in the text-book and of time in the class-room that can be given to any one of them. I meet this difficulty in college teaching by limiting attention to a comparatively small number of topics, upon the theory that it is better to study a few thoroughly than a larger number superficially. Of these topics I furnish a detailed outline as a basis for discussion. Whether a similar method could be adopted to advantage in the high school is at least worth considering. A particular difficulty in the treatment of topics connected with American expansion is that they are unintelligible without some knowledge of geography, and geography is the one thing that students of every grade obstinately refuse to know anything about. Old John Smith said in his "Generall Historie of Virginia" that "For as Geography without History

seemeth a carkasse without motion, so History, without Geography, wandreth a vagrant without a certain habitation." This is particularly true of the treatment of the Louisiana purchase.

To get an adequate background for the Louisiana purchase it is necessary to begin with the European occupation of North America. Florida was originally Spanish, discovered by Ponce de Leon and settled by the Spaniards at St. Augustine and Pensacola. Louisiana was originally French. Joliet discovered the upper Mississippi and La Salle descended the river to its mouth and claimed the whole basin for the King of France. Later La Salle tried to found a colony on the Texas coast, but he was assassinated and his colony quickly disappeared, giving France no basis of claim to Texas.¹ Still later Iberville

¹ Franquelin's map shows that La Salle strangely mis-conceived the location of the mouth of the Mississippi, supposing it to be on the Texas coast. In his attempt to found a colony, he missed the mouth of the Mississippi, because he sailed to the point on the Texan coast, where he erroneously supposed the mouth to be.

and Bienville occupied the Gulf Coast at Biloxi and Mobile, and founded New Orleans upon the Mississippi. Informally, the Perdido River, the present western boundary of the State of Florida, was agreed upon as the boundary between Spanish Florida and French Louisiana. Thus Louisiana originally consisted of the basin of the Mississippi and the Gulf Coast from the Mississippi to the Perdido.

By the Treaty of Paris of 1763 France ceded all of Eastern Louisiana, except the Isle of Orleans, to England and guaranteed to British subjects the free navigation of the Mississippi to the sea. By the same treaty Spain ceded Florida to England. To compensate Spain for the loss of Florida, France had ceded Western Louisiana and the Isle of Orleans to Spain by a secret treaty the year before.² The Isle of Orleans was the island upon which stood the city of New Orleans, lying east of the Mississippi and cut off on the north from the mainland by the Iberville River and by Lakes Maurepas, Pontchartrain and Borgne.³ Henceforth Louisiana consisted of the western basin of the Mississippi and the Isle of Orleans. Spain did not take possession of the province until 1769, and with this extent "France possessed it" from 1763 to 1769, a period of six years. England erected the former Spanish province of Florida and all that part of Louisiana, which she had received from France, that bordered upon the Gulf, into the provinces of East and West Florida, dividing them by the line of the Appalachian River.

During the American Revolution, Spain entered the war as the ally of France, but obstinately refused to assist the United States. The chief reason for this refusal was the rivalry of both for the possession of the western territory, and this territory was wanted by both chiefly because it controlled the Mississippi—mere land being at that time a drug on the market.⁴ At the close of the American Revolution Great Britain recognized the independence of the United States, with the Mississippi as its western boundary as far south as the 31st parallel, and granted to the United States the right which she had received from France of navigating the Mississippi below that parallel to its mouth. At the same time England ceded to Spain the two Floridas, which included, as we have seen, original Spanish Florida, and that part of Louisiana, bordering upon the Gulf, which she had received from France. Spain thus acquired the territory on both sides of all the outlets of the Mississippi. She contended that the English right to navigate the river to the sea had been lost, when she lost her posts on the

lower river, and that in undertaking to cede this right to the United States she had ceded what she did not have. The United States maintained on the other hand that the British right of navigation was a condition under which Spain had received Louisiana, and that it was independent of possession since England had never possessed either bank of the Mississippi below the Iberville.

The movement of population across the Alleghenies began before the Revolution and proceeded with great rapidity after it. By the census of 1800 there were over 326,000 people in Kentucky and Tennessee alone. These people were wholly dependent upon the Mississippi for an outlet for their produce, since transportation across the mountains was impracticable. In 1786 Jay negotiated a treaty with Spain, which proposed to waive the navigation of the lower Mississippi for twenty-five years, and, although the treaty was rejected, the mere fact that the proposal was considered created in the West a profound distrust of the Federal Government. After 1786 the navigation of the lower river was closed to the Americans, and the export of their produce could be effected only by the payment of heavy duties or the bribery of the Spanish officials. Finally, in 1795, in order to forestall a possible alliance between the United States and England, Spain, by the treaty of San Lorenzo, granted to the United States the right of navigating the river to the sea, and granted a right of deposit at New Orleans for three years, with the promise that it would either be continued thereafter or an equivalent establishment provided elsewhere.

In the years following the American Revolution, both England and France engaged in a long series of intrigues to secure possession of the Mississippi valley.⁵ It was the policy of France to establish a colonial empire in the West Indies and to recover Louisiana in order to establish a source of food supply for the West Indian empire that would render it independent of the United States. The first step in this program was taken in 1795 in securing the cession of St. Domingo from Spain by the treaty of Basel. Napoleon desired to recover Louisiana at the same time, but Spain refused to cede more. In 1800 he sent his minister of war, Berthier, to Spain and he forced the "retrocession" of Louisiana by the secret treaty of St. Ildefonso. Louisiana was receded "with the extent that it now has in the hands of Spain and that it had when France possessed it." This extent was the Isle of Orleans and the western basin of the Mississippi, in which form France had possessed the province from 1763 to 1769. It did not include any part of the Floridas, since Spain had received them from England and could not "retrocede" to France territory which she had not received from her. To guard against American opposition to

² See W. R. Shepard, "The Cession of Louisiana to Spain," in "Political Science Quarterly," XIX, 439-58.

³ The former channel of the Iberville is represented on the modern map by Bayou Manchac and the Amité River. Bayou Manchac has been filled to prevent overflow of the Mississippi.

⁴ For a full presentation of this situation, see P. C. Phillips' "The West in the Diplomacy of the American Revolution," University of Illinois Studies in Social Sciences, 1913.

⁵ See F. J. Turner, "Diplomatic Contest for the Mississippi Valley," in "Atlantic Monthly," Vol. 93, and "Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley," in "American Historical Review," Vol. 10. P. C. Phillips has shown that Turner is in error in accepting as genuine a "Memoire" printed in 1802 as the work of Vergennes.

his colonial projects, Napoleon at this time adjusted outstanding difficulties with the United States by the Convention of 1800. In the public treaty of Madrid, signed March 21, 1801, Lucien Bonaparte secured a confirmation of the secret cession of Louisiana by the treaty of 1800.

It was not until the European war drew to a close that Napoleon found time to take possession of St. Domingo. Late in 1801 he sent out General Leclerc, his brother-in-law, for the purpose. Formal peace with England was signed at Amiens in March, 1802, and Napoleon turned to plans for taking possession of Louisiana. It was only by giving a formal pledge that he would never alienate the province that he could secure from the Spanish King an order for its delivery. Meantime the pacification of St. Domingo was proving much more difficult than had been anticipated. Yellow fever destroyed Leclerc's army, and the rumored re-establishment of slavery aroused the blacks to insurrection. September 16, 1802, Leclerc wrote Napoleon that 28,000 men had already been sacrificed and that only 4,000 remained. Three weeks later he wrote that 12,000 men and \$1,200,000 in money must be sent immediately, else St. Domingo would be forever lost to France.

The last of March, 1801, Rufus King wrote from London that it was rumored that Spain had ceded Louisiana and the Floridas to France, and in September Robert R. Livingston, American minister to France, was instructed to purchase West Florida, if it had been acquired. A year later, when ill news came from St. Domingo, Napoleon began to consider the advisability of abandoning the colonial project. Dr. T. M. Marshall has recently shown⁶ that it was at this time, instead of in the following spring, as supposed by Henry Adams, that the famous bathroom quarrel between Napoleon and his brothers, Lucien and Joseph, took place. October 28, 1802, Livingston wrote that Joseph Bonaparte had asked him two days before whether the United States preferred West Florida to Louisiana, thus intimating that Louisiana might be ceded, but not communicating the fact that West Florida had not been acquired. Livingston replied that he was instructed to secure only West Florida, and Napoleon resumed his plans for occupying Louisiana. November 26, 1802, he issued orders instructing General Victor to occupy the territory from the Iberville to the Rio Grande. Mr. Adams discovered these instructions in the French archives and regarded them as confirming the American claim that Louisiana included Texas. The assumption that evidence of Napoleon's intention to take anything is proof of his right to take it is grotesque. It only shows that great historians as well as small ones sometimes make the mistake of exaggerating the importance of their own discoveries. Victor, detained by reports of continued disaster at St. Domingo, and by rumors of probable renewal of European war, never sailed for America.

In October of 1802 the Spanish local authorities suspended the right of deposit at New Orleans, without providing for deposit at any other point, as guaranteed by the treaty of 1795. This act caused great excitement in the United States. Coming upon the heels of the cession of Louisiana to France, the suspension was naturally, though as it proved erroneously, supposed to have been dictated by Napoleon, and to indicate a fixed intention upon his part to close the Mississippi to American trade. Jefferson took the ground that the possession of New Orleans by France would drive the United States into alliance with England. In January, 1803, he sent Monroe as special envoy to France and Spain with instructions to purchase New Orleans and West Florida, if possible, and, if not possible, to at least recover the right of deposit.

Before Monroe reached Paris, Napoleon had decided to sell Louisiana. It was Mr. Adams, who first pointed out that the American acquisition of Louisiana resulted from the French failure in St. Domingo. In January of 1803 Napoleon received report of the death of Leclerc and the demand of his successor that 35,000 men be immediately sent to the island. Trouble with England thickened and renewal of European war threatened. Sunday morning, April 10, Napoleon summoned Marbois, minister of the treasury, and Berthier, minister of war, and proposed the sale of Louisiana. Marbois had been intendant at St. Domingo and from his knowledge of conditions there argued in favor of the sale of the province. Berthier had secured the treaty of retrocession and argued against it. Early Monday morning, April 11, receiving positive reports of English preparations to renew the war, Napoleon summoned Marbois and ordered him to sell Louisiana. Later in the day Talleyrand offered Louisiana to Livingston, but Livingston refused it. The next day, Tuesday, April 12, regretting his refusal, Livingston tried to get Talleyrand to make the cession. At noon Monroe reached Paris. Wednesday night, April 13, Livingston entertained Monroe and Marbois at dinner, and, late at night, after Monroe had withdrawn, Livingston agreed with Marbois to purchase Louisiana. Some weeks were spent in haggling over the price, which was finally settled by two treaties, the first signed May 2 and the second May 8 or 9, but both dated April 30. By the first treaty the United States was to pay France 11 1-4 million dollars, and by the second the United States was to pay her own citizens in satisfaction of their claims against France 3 3-4 million dollars, making a total of 15 millions. Consummated just at the moment of Monroe's arrival in Paris, the impression was produced that he had secured the cession and Livingston felt that he was deprived of the credit to which he was entitled. In point of fact, neither was entitled to any other credit than that of reluctantly receiving what was thrust upon them. They had asked for West Florida and received an empire. It was not Louisiana but the navigation of the Mississippi that they wanted. Napoleon ceded Louisiana to put it beyond the reach

⁶ "History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase," page 4, University of California Publications, 1914.

of England, and to keep the United States from joining England in the approaching war. It was thus Napoleon, rather than Canning, who first "called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old."

Jefferson had doubts about the constitutionality of the purchase, and originally proposed a constitutional amendment in order to validate it, but, hearing from Livingston that there was danger that Napoleon might change his mind he wrote that "the less we say about constitutional difficulties the better," and urged in several private letters that whatever was necessary be done "sub-silentio." The treaty was attacked in both Houses of Congress by the Federalists. No one questioned the right of the United States to acquire territory, but it was charged that the provision of the treaty, which promised that the inhabitants should be incorporated in the Union, exceeded the treaty-making power. As this promise was conditioned by the clause, "according to the principles of the Federal constitution," it may be regarded as unassailable. The most significant fact is that the treaty was negotiated by Jefferson and Madison as President and Secretary of State, and defended in Congress by Breckenridge, Taylor and Nicolas, the very men who had been most prominent in passing the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, and who were thus forever afterward committed to a broad construction of the Constitution.

Napoleon had ceded what he did not yet possess. November 30, 1803, Louisiana was delivered by the Spanish officers to the French prefect, Laussat, and December 20, twenty days later, it was delivered to the United States. The province was ceded "as fully and in the same manner" as it had been acquired by France by the treaty of St. Ildefonso. It therefore consisted of the western basin of the Mississippi and of the Isle of Orleans. The United States immediately set up the claim that Louisiana included that part of West Florida, extending to the Perdido, which formed a part of the original province of Louisiana, and also that it included Texas as far as the Rio Grande. The first pretension was persisted in until we forced Spain to sell both Floridas by the treaty of 1819, and the second pretension was revived when we finally acquired Texas in 1845 under the pretext of "re-annexation." The United States has often been exasperated by the dilatory and devious diplomacy of Spain, but we have taken small account of the exasperation that Spain must have felt from our insistence upon two utterly invalid claims. If the student is puzzled to understand how Germans can at the present day convince themselves that they are waging a war of self-defense, let him recall the fact that Americans for two generations convinced themselves, in the face of the plainest evidence to the contrary, that West Florida and Texas were both a part of Louisiana, and that many writers and nearly all official documents still cling to both pretensions. There is no greater menace to the future safety of the United States than the teaching of what is called patriotic history. On the other hand, there is no

greater guarantee of that safety than the teaching of history in such a way that students will relentlessly recognize the truth irrespective of national pretensions.

By the Spanish treaty of 1819 the western boundary of Louisiana was fixed along the Sabine, Red and Arkansas Rivers, and thence to the 42d parallel and the Rocky Mountains. By the same treaty Spain ceded to the United States such claims as she had to Oregon, in virtual exchange, as Dr. T. M. Marshall points out, for the factitious claims which we had set up to Texas. Already by the Convention of 1818 with England, the northern boundary of Louisiana had been fixed as the 49th parallel from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains. By this Convention we secured so much of the basin of the Red River of the North as lay south of the 49th parallel, but sacrificed further to the west some portion of the basin of the Missouri that lay north of it. We may, therefore, be regarded as having exchanged one for the other. The basin of the Red River, although not geographically a part of Louisiana, came to us therefore as a result of the Louisiana purchase. From the 42d to the 49th parallels, the western boundary of Louisiana was of course the crest of the Rocky Mountains.

It was inevitable that the importance of the purchase of Louisiana should not be recognized at the time. Livingston wrote that the sum to be paid for Louisiana could be "raised by the sale of the territory west of the Mississippi to some European power whose proximity we should not fear." Opponents of the purchase predicted that it would weaken the United States by scattering her population, and that republican institutions could not be maintained over so large an area. Even Jefferson thought that the most important use to which the acquired territory would ever be put would be to furnish a permanent home for the Red Man. From the vantage point of the present day, it is easy to see that the purchase is one of the most momentous events in American history. It was the first step in a series of territorial accessions that carried our boundaries to the Pacific. It rendered possible that tremendous movement of population which has given us the command of North America and the leadership in the Western Hemisphere. Scarcely less important is the fact that by committing the Jeffersonian party to broad construction, it rendered possible the development of a government strong enough to save itself in time of stress, and eventually to take its place among the great powers of the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

There are general accounts of the Louisiana purchase in the first volume of Schouler's "History of the United States," in the second and third volumes of McMaster's "History of the People of the United States," and in Channing's "Jeffersonian System," which is the twelfth volume of Hart's "American Nation" series. By far the most important account is in Volumes I and II of Henry Adams's "History of the United States," but it is too long for secondary

school use. There are two popular histories of "The Louisiana Purchase," of the sort that Professor Violette thinks ought to be provided for high school use, one by James K. Hosmer (New York, Appleton, 1902), and the other by Ripley Hitchcock (Boston, Ginn & Co., 1904). There is some interesting matter and a considerable number of errors in Binger Herman's "Louisiana Purchase," published in 1898 by the United States Government, and obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents for 65 cents. A collection of "The State Papers and Correspondence Bearing Upon the Purchase of the Territory of Louisiana" was printed by the Government as House document 431 for the second session of the 57th Congress, which is obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents for 25 cents. An important source of information is "The History of Louisiana, particularly

of the Cession of that Colony to the United States," by Barbé Marbois, the French negotiator of the treaty, which was published in an English translation in Philadelphia in 1830. The book has been long out of print, but copies are not uncommon in second-hand catalogues, although they are usually priced rather high. Marbois tells the story by putting speeches into the mouths of the chief actors, after the manner of the ancients, and these speeches are not to be taken too seriously. There is an interesting summary of "The World Aspects of the Louisiana Purchase," by Wm. M. Sloane, in the "American Historical Review," Vol. IX, pp. 505-21. References already cited in the footnotes are not repeated. The present writer has emphasized the least interesting phase of the Louisiana purchase for the reason that it is the one that is commonly least understood.

A Canadian Port in War Time

BY B. H. NYE, M.A., YONKERS, N. Y.

To the average American citizen the great European war seems quite remote unless it happens that his business has suffered, or that he still has relatives on the other side engaged in the fighting. A visit to one of our great ports shows nothing unusual to the casual observer, although a number of German ocean liners are interned in several of our harbors. Many steamers of the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg American Line, lie idle at their New York piers. Now and then a vessel can be seen arriving or leaving with her national flag flying, her name and nationality painted in large letters on her side. There is, however, no unwonted activity on the part of the military and naval authorities; they may be a little more watchful than in the past, but it is done quietly and without attracting attention.

On the other hand, when approaching the Canadian port of Halifax, before the steamer reaches the twenty-eight mile buoy, a small schooner comes along side and a pilot is taken on to guide the steamer into the one narrow, circuitous channel left open for navigation through the mine fields.

The shore about the harbor is exceedingly attractive. To the southward the coast rises abruptly and is quite rocky; from the north a long sand bar or point juts out towards the south, between these lies the entrance to the harbor. The top of the rocks to the south is thick with pines, while the northerly point, sloping back from the water, is covered with scattered groups of pines.

On passing the buoy and proceeding further up the bay, the southern shore loses its bluff aspect and both shores present a similar appearance. Coming up slowly through the mine fields a submarine pops up off to the northward, looks the steamer over and sinks out of sight again. The steamer is British and evidently known, otherwise the buoy could not have been passed without a challenge.

That point under those pines would be an ideal place for a picnic. But hold! On closer inspection the glasses show a small cabin painted green so that it would blend with the foliage, and just outside stand two men in khaki watching the steamer through glasses. Doubtless there are many of these concealed observation stations about the harbor. What a queer sensation to suddenly discover that a spy system is being carried on along the shore.

The hillside also holds surprises; guns were poking out over the top of nearly every green bank and from among the pines, some high up on the hillside making silhouettes against the sky, others close to the water's edge; sentries also could be seen pacing back and forth near other embankments, which, without doubt, concealed more guns.

Near the lighthouse the vessel stops while the guard-ship comes out for inspection and passes the boat. One of the guard-boats was a decided freak; she was only as large as a fair-sized tug, yet she had a ram bow which looked big enough to sink a battleship. Her stack slanted well aft as did her pilot house. She was built to "look smart," as the Canadians put it, but she does not exactly look it.

After being passed by the boarding officer, the captain is ordered to hoist a certain signal and proceed. As the vessel moves on, a series of toots arises; this is the guard-ship telegraphing to the fort on the hill that the steamer is all right and may proceed. The news of the steamer's approach is quickly sent ahead to the inner batteries. This notice, together with the signal hoist, which must be kept up until the dock is reached, prevents the forts from firing on the coming guests.

It is said that Halifax harbor is impregnable. This must be true. The distance from shore to shore at the entrance is not much over half a mile and there are guns placed behind every clump of trees.

It would be impossible for any ship to live if all

the batteries should open on her. Farther up the bay an island is seen in the middle of the entrance. This is entirely covered with fortifications, which, with those on the mainland completely control both entrances to the harbor.

There is a lighthouse on this island, and the keeper and his family are the only civilians allowed here. At night strong searchlights, placed on the island, pour a fixed light on both shores of the mainland, so that any boat entering must pass through these beams of light.

Behind the island lies the real harbor and the city of Halifax. The former is large enough to hold the entire British navy and has a depth of sixty feet at the piers. The harbor presents a very interesting sight; there are more sailing ships to be seen here than in any large American port. Many of the barques and barkentines are from Norway, Sweden and Denmark, and have their national flag painted twice on each side, once near the bow and once near the stern, while in between the two the ship's name and her country appear in large letters, a reminder that liners are not the only ones that suffer from German submarines. Near the north shore, out of the way of the shipping, lie a number of steamers "under orders to the Admiralty." They carry oil and other supplies for the English navy. Farther up the H. M. C. S. Niobe, Canada's navy, can be seen, while nearer, towering above the other ships, lies the Caronia, now painted slate gray from funnel to water line with guns mounted forward, aft and at intervals along the promenade decks that formerly resounded to the tramp of Americans going across "to do" Europe or returning home with empty pockets. Now and then a small tug steams by; every space on her is filled by men in khaki, so that from a distance she has a brownish tinge. It is the ferry which carries the officers and men from the forts down the harbor to the city on leave.

In walking about the town the number of men in khaki attracts the attention; almost every other man is a soldier. Now and then a group salute another figure in brown, an officer on his way to some one of the numerous military offices that are scattered about the city. The sailors seem more sociable than the soldiers as they usually travel in pairs or groups of three or four.

A look into the shop windows is sufficient to tell the tourist that Canada is at war. The boot and shoe shops display "regulation boots;" men's furnishing stores have bundles of "putties," officers' handkerchiefs and patriotic hat bands. But it is in the jewelry stores that patriotism runs riot; the national flag is used in a hundred different ways, in pins, belt buckles and the like. Then, too, the leaders of the army and the navy have not escaped; their faces decorate spoons, trays, pins and other objects. No doubt the purchase of any of these articles shows patriotism, but with few exceptions the pleasure of owning one would be fleeting.

On blank walls and billboards throughout the town are notices that men are wanted for that bat-

alion or that regiment; the navy also has room for new recruits; the daily papers of course are filled with appeals to the male populace to enlist and help save the Empire. Many promenades along the fortifications that once were open to the public are now closed to all but sentries.

Upon the hill back of the town the old Citadel is alive with men, and the near-by barracks and officers' quarters are all filled. A barbed wire fence encircles the Citadel and sentries walk back and forth on top of the great wall. A double guard is posted at the gateway and none but those having military business and showing proper credentials may enter. On the embankment near the semaphore and signal hoist there is always a group of men in brown, one or more of whom are constantly watching the bay through glasses; sometimes a submarine is seen going by, for there are a number stationed here, and a destroyer or two lie at anchor together with several cruisers; these have their funnels painted in great grey and white triangles, semicircles and curves, and a great white wave at the bow, all done to deceive the enemy. With stacks painted in this manner the range finder on the enemy's ships cannot get a straight line and so cannot estimate the distance correctly. The great bow wave also has its purpose, for at sea and looking through the glasses, the observer on another vessel would suppose the cruiser to be going much faster than was really the case.

Music of a military kind which is so stimulating was most noticeably absent; a few bugle calls now and then, and those rather faint, are all that furnishes audible reminder that the country is at war. Down the bay the guns at target practice can be heard. This usually consists in having a tug, towing a couple of small rafts with screens at the end of a long cable, steam rapidly past a battery. Then for a few minutes there is a noise as the guns open on the floats. The drilling of the troops goes on at quite a distance from the city, a company marching under arms is rarely seen.

A feeling of earnestness pervades the city. The people realize that war is a serious business. An early cessation of hostilities is not looked for, but a confidence of ultimate victory is manifest. In England itself there seems to be a spirit of indifference to the war, but this cannot be said of Halifax, and what is true of the one city is true of all Canada. Everyone seems to be trying to do his share to help the "Empire" win, for they have a broader view of the situation, broader possibly than even that held in England. The Canadians are not concerned so much with England itself as with the "Empire" and that means Australia, South Africa, India and all British possessions.

Paul Mijouef discusses the "Influences of the War on Education in Russia" in the "Educational Review" for April, in an unexpectedly optimistic way.

The Definition of the Field of Secondary School History

The ineffectiveness of history teaching in secondary schools has been attributed to many causes. It has been blamed upon text-books, low salaries, absence of history equipment, and other material deficiencies. It has been charged that history teachers are not as well prepared to teach their subject as are teachers of other subjects. And then the normal schools, colleges and universities have been held responsible for placing poor history teachers in the schools.

For some time there has been a feeling that the difficulty lies not only in the materials or in the teachers, but also in the way history is organized for school purposes. This view was expressed in the pages of the *MAGAZINE* as early as February, 1910, and has recently received considerable support. It was discussed at the December, 1915, meeting of the American Historical Association, in a joint session with members of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. It was also taken up at the joint meeting of the American Historical Association and the California History Teachers' Association held at Berkeley, July 22, 1915. The papers which follow are those presented at these meetings. It is interesting to note that the sentiment of the December meeting—attended largely by eastern teachers—was overwhelmingly in favor of a definition of the fields of history; while the July meeting, composed principally of western teachers, was not so favorably inclined to the plan.

The papers at Oakland discussed the desirability of the suggested two-year course in ancient, medieval and modern history, while this subject was scarcely touched upon at the Washington meeting.

The December conference passed a resolution requesting the Committee on History in Schools to proceed to a definition of a list of topics for each of the periods of secondary school history. This committee, of which Prof. W. S. Ferguson, of Harvard University, is chairman, has already started upon this work.

Discussion at the Washington Conference

REMARKS BY PROF. HERBERT D. FOSTER, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

I. ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT.

For some years there has been a growing feeling that the fields of history taught in schools were so wide that it was almost impossible to teach them well, and that there was grave danger of superficiality and vagueness. Especially was this felt in connection with ancient history with its Oriental connections and its extension to about 800 A. D., as recommended by the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association in 1899, and re-affirmed by a Committee of Five of that Association in 1911. The Committee of Five suggested a way of relief through omission of unessentials and emphasis of essentials giving a few helpful illustrations of what it meant (pages 26-29). Some of that committee felt, and many others

expressed a desire, that the helpful step there begun or suggested of indicating essential things should be carried further.

In 1911 at the Conference of Teachers of History in Secondary Schools, held in connection with the Charleston meeting of the American Historical Association, on motion of Principal James Sullivan, of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, it was voted to suggest to the American Historical Association the desirability of attempting to define the fields of history taught in the schools. At this meeting it was further suggested that the various history teachers' associations consider this matter, and bring it before the American Historical Association, and be ready to co-operate with the latter. In pursuance of that suggestion the councils of the New England History Teachers' Association and of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association transmitted such formal requests to the American Historical Association. The matter was more or less formally advocated by other history teachers' associations. Among other requests to the American Historical Association there came at the suggestion of both school and college teachers a petition from the College Entrance Examination Board. The Council of the American Historical Association, therefore, in view of these various requests, appointed a year ago at the Chicago meeting, December, 1914, a Committee on History in Schools, and referred to that committee a request for a fuller definition of the fields of history.

So far it had been quite clear that the desire for a fuller definition was shared by both school and college. The hope was that such a definition would be of service to all the pupils in schools and to all the teachers, and not merely to those pupils preparing for college or to those teachers interested in college entrance examinations. Somewhat unfortunately, the phrase used in referring the question to the Committee on History in Schools and the phrase therefore reproduced in the questionnaire sent out to about 4,000 members of various historical associations, contained the words which indicated only one phase of the problem. These words which seemed to arouse misunderstanding and some wholesome strength of feeling were: "A 'fuller definition of the history requirement for entrance to college, showing especially the points to be emphasized and those to be more lightly treated,' as requested by the College Entrance Examination Board." Perhaps it was natural enough, since some of the requests from the conferences and the History Teachers' Associations or their committees had been more or less informal, or had not been transmitted officially to the Council of the American Historical Association, and since these associations were local while the College Entrance Board was not, that the Council quoted the form of the request from the College Entrance Board.

The nature of the Committee on History in Schools and of its work may possibly be further clarified by calling attention to two facts. First, the committee

is made up of teachers in both school and college from all sections of the country with a chairman who has knowledge of teaching conditions in both school and college in California and New England, and under quite different circumstances. Second, it is distinctly stated in the questionnaire, as it has been understood from the beginning, that: "It is assumed that the committee will be assisted in this work by committees of the New England History Teachers' Association, the Association of the History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, the Mississippi Valley Historical Society, the Commission on Accredited Schools of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, the California History Teachers' Association, and other similar associations."

It is to be feared that some of the points just mentioned were not understood or taken into account by those who answered the questionnaire. If the broader scope of the origin and purpose of the Committee on History in Schools be understood, there will be little apprehension of any dictation or interference with the liberties of the teachers, or of the imperiling of the interests of the mass of secondary pupils for the advantage of those preparing for college.

II. REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

With these friendly preliminary handshakes, let us plunge into the arena of figures and more or less reliable statistics. To change the figure for a more homely one, familiar to any one who has lived in the pie belt, you may have found at Thanksgiving that it is well to get the core of your apple out before you peel by hand. In this way you may be relieved of some unnecessary peeling. The core of our apple is the clear mandate demanding a fuller definition of history. Out of 402 replies to this question, only 50 were opposed to or doubtful about the desirability of the fuller definition. That is, 88 per cent. of those who replied to the first question favored a fuller definition. It may be interesting to look at the inside of our core and find that the majority of the small number who opposed the definition were not school but college teachers.

An even larger proportion, 92 per cent. of those who answered Question II, favored the specific plan of dividing the content of each field by including the "essential main topics with little or no sub-division, which certainly ought to be included and emphasized."

It appears, therefore, very clear that the replies give the committee a mandate to define the content of each field of history, and that this definition should be based at least upon the topics to be included and emphasized.

Not so large a majority, but still about 73 per cent., of those who answered the question favored including in this definition "topics which should probably be omitted or else lightly treated." A smaller majority of those answering, but still a majority amounting to about 68 per cent., favored including also "topics which certainly should be omitted."

It is almost impossible to express in figures the re-

sults of answers to Question III: "Or do you think it wise to limit the definition, for the present at least, to the collateral reading, in such a way that the definition would involve the preparation of a list of topics on which collateral reading in each subject should be required, and which should be made the basis of examination?" As an exclusive alternative, a majority did not favor this plan of a list of topics for collateral reading and examination. The somewhat unfortunate wording of this question necessitated a choice between this and the plan of list of essential topics. In spite of this a surprising number—83—insisted on rejecting the form of the question and asking for *both* Plan II and Plan III (that is, for both a list of essential topics and also a list of topics for collateral reading). Some went further and asked also for list of books. Moreover, some misunderstood the question and thought the list of topics for collateral reading, rather than the matter in text-books or the list of essential topics, was intended to be the basis of examination. If it would be fair to include the replies which indicated a desire for both Plan II and Plan III, and also some expressing a qualified assent to the plan of topics for collateral reading, then a little over one-half the replies to Question III would be regarded as favorable to the inclusion of topics for collateral reading. It is certain that the replies, in view of the somewhat unsatisfactory wording of the last question, exhibited a widespread desire for some further statement or recommendation regarding collateral reading. This conclusion would also be substantiated by the "Remarks" appended to the questionnaire, and by the common knowledge among all teachers of a desire for some clarification of the situation as to collateral reading.

There were, of course, many qualifications in the answers to various questions so that the tabulation necessitated some discretion; but in general these qualifications did not appear so numerous or fundamental as to vitiate the result. A good many, for example, expressed the qualification that the definition should be made by a committee including both school and college teachers, and representing various parts of the country; or that the definition should not be made the matter of dictation, but of recommendation by this association. Such qualifications seemed pretty self-evident and certain to be met. A more serious point arises, however, in connection with this fundamental question. Are the courses to be defined the four courses recommended by the previous committees of the American Historical Association or the tentative propositions of the National Educational Association for only three courses? This question was noted in only 16 replies. It would be logical to expect a committee of the American Historical Association in defining the fields of history to define them in accordance with the courses already laid down by committees of that association. It is perhaps necessary to call attention to the fact that the Committee of Five did *not* recommend three courses, but did recommend four courses in history.

III. QUERIES.

Certain questions naturally suggest themselves as the result of an examination of the replies.

1. Can we help to harmonize the four courses recommended by the Committee of Seven with the four courses recommended by the Committee of Five? The replies to a questionnaire recently sent out by the Bureau of Education indicate, according to the statement of Professor Johnson, of Teachers' College, that the great majority of the schools are following the courses recommended by the Committee of Seven. It is possible that the present committee met the situation by defining in addition to the four courses of the Committee of Seven the course recommended on modern European history since the early part of the eighteenth century recommended as Block C by the Committee of Five. This plan of adding the modern European history to the four courses of the Committee of Five has already been adopted in the comprehensive scheme of examinations followed by Harvard, Yale, and Princeton.

2. How can we carry out the happy suggestion of one of the veteran friends of good teaching and the liberty of the teacher, the President of the American Historical Association, Professor Burr, of Cornell, as reproduced in the words of the chairman of this committee: "Give teachers greater liberty to develop the subject according to their own individuality and interest, by defining a minimum of essential topics, which so long as a minimum is not indicated they could less easily do?" This is a somewhat new and fruitful point of view. Perhaps it would help in clarifying the next two questions.

3. Would it seem less like dictation or would it seem a relief, if, after actual experimentation in the schools and mature consideration by representative bodies and teachers in both school and college, the list of essential topics to be emphasized should be accepted by examining bodies as forming a substantial part of the basis for examination?

4. How can we avoid playing into the hands of "cram schools and coaches" in the matter of entrance examinations? A suggestion that seems logical may help to answer both this and the previous query, or at least to elicit discussion. Why not utilize any minimum of essential topics to give the teacher greater freedom and teacher and pupil greater security in regard to a substantial proportion of the examinations? This could be secured by utilizing the minimum list of topics as an essential, if you please the major part, but not as the whole basis of examination, and then by giving as wide a range as feasible of other topics on which the student might show his power. This plan would seem to be given increased value if it included among this large range some topics suitable for collateral reading. Still greater would be its value if the Committee on History in Schools proceeds to draw up such a list of topics for collateral reading. Of course, such questions might be grouped in various ways in the examination paper. Do the foregoing suggestions offer a possible solution of the following question?

5. How can a fuller definition of each course, through essential topics to be emphasized, be brought into relation with a reasonable program as to collateral reading? One possible answer to this in the case of the difficult course in ancient history would be the following plan: Let the list of essential topics for everybody drawn up by this committee serve as the basis so far as proves practicable for the beginner's course in ancient history given to children of fourteen the first year in the high school. Then let the list of topics for collateral reading be drawn upon in such varied ways as may be possible under different circumstances in different schools where it is desirable to make this course in ancient history of character suitable for preparing students for entrance to college.

6. Finally, how can we make it evident in intent and result that the American Historical Association and the Committee on History in Schools are true to the larger purposes of the teaching and study of history, and do not have in mind merely the interests of any special class like college preparatory students, but rather the more fundamental interests of the whole body of pupils and teachers in secondary schools and of our own citizenship?

Perhaps it ought to be said that in the estimates given above there have been included those replies to precisely the same questions which were sent out at the request of the chairman of the committee in October directly through the New England History Teachers' Association. Of course, duplicates have been excluded; and the results would not materially affect our mandate, for instance a change of 1 per cent. in the favorable answer to Question I.

It seems reasonably clear from the 412 replies from all sections of the country that, to quote the words of another member of the committee who has read the replies: "We have a clear mandate to proceed on the method indicated in Question II (c), viz., essential topics to be included and emphasized;" and to quote further from the same member with whom in both cases the tabulator would agree, that the answers indicate a widespread desire "that something be done to indicate more precisely a reasonable demand in the matter of collateral reading."

It was in accordance with the conclusions drawn from both the replies and the discussion at the conference at Washington, December 31, 1915, that the conference unanimously passed the following vote, "That the Committee on History in Schools be instructed by this conference to make a fuller definition of the field of history on the basis of topics to be emphasized and topics for collateral reading."¹

¹ Copy of vote passed by the Conference on History in Schools of the American Historical Association.

That the Committee on History in Schools be authorized to prepare a more precise definition of the fields of history on the basis of a list of essential topics to be emphasized, and a list of topics for collateral reading.

That the Committee on History in Schools of the American Historical Association be requested to co-operate, or correspond, with the similar committee of the National Education Association.

REMARKS BY PROF. HENRY E. BOURNE, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY.

It is hardly necessary at this stage of the discussion to argue the need of a fuller definition of the History Requirement for Entrance to College or for General School Courses. The statistics just presented prove the need beyond question. The practical unanimity of the teachers who have been consulted is not surprising in view of the record made upon examination by candidates for college. The situation must be well nigh intolerable when the chief reader in history suggests in his report, apropos of the ratings in medieval and modern history, "That such a subject should be dropped from the list of examinations for the reason that the schools do not give adequate preparation in it." Although the unsatisfactory condition of the secondary work in history is revealed sharply in the statistics of the College Entrance Board, it is almost equally apparent where the certificate system is used and where the only test applied is in the effort of the college teacher to build his work upon the foundation already laid. The wish too often expressed that his students had not taken history before entering college is a forcible, if ungallant, reminder that something is wrong. The source of the evil is not far to seek. If no agreement exists upon what is to be understood by a course in any of the four fields, how can an examiner write a paper that candidates can pass, or how can a college teacher carry on the work assuming a definite basis of attainment?

Other elements undoubtedly aggravate the condition. It is true that the subject is still assigned in many schools to inexperienced teachers or to those who have little knowledge of history and less interest in it. Nevertheless, it is obvious that their failure is rendered the more certain because not even the excellent teachers, nor the trainers of teachers, nor the makers of programs, agree upon what are the essential elements of a course, either the topics to be treated or the methods according to which the work is to be carried on. Under the circumstances to speak of history *units* seems like a jest.

In the management of well organized school subjects, like chemistry, English, Latin, or the modern languages, the teacher is in no uncertainty as to what is to be taught. He knows the point he must reach at each stage of the course and how the work should be done. To deviate in any essential particular would be to mark himself as ignorant or eccentric. The individuality of the teacher of history is not hampered in this fashion. He may wander as fancy impels, and in any way his ingenuity suggests, over a wide range of topics, lingering or hastening on. No disagreeable criticisms need be anticipated, if only he completes the text-book within the period fixed by the curriculum.

The difficulties of the situation are increased by the lack of a commonly accepted order in which the four fields find a place in the curriculum. As a result of the elective system few students take more than two of the four. This doubles the confusion. If a medieval and modern history course is to be de-

finied, shall this be done to suit the capacity of pupils of the second year or of the fourth? Shall it be assumed that the pupil has already taken ancient history or English history, or no history at all? If the class includes pupils who have had no previous courses and others who have had different courses, taken at different stages of maturity, and, consequently by a different method, how is it possible to give the course anything beyond an informational character?

The difficulty is increased by the failure in some quarters to differentiate secondary work from college work. The writers and publishers of school and college text-books are tempted to treat this defect as a virtue because it enlarges the market of particular books. The lack of differentiation may touch the selection of topics as well as the method of conducting the course. No excuse for anticipating the maturer method and point of view can be drawn from the fact that a majority of secondary pupils do not go to college. The history set before them should be suited to their capacity, training, and grade of experience. Under such limitations it should be of the sort that will be most serviceable in enabling them to comprehend our civilization and its origins and to approach in an intelligent way some of the more obvious problems of modern life. It should be preparatory in this sense, whether the pupil is to carry his studies further or they are to end with the secondary school. To attempt to do college work in the high school is as bad a blunder as to subordinate high school work to the requirements of the arbitrary standard which the colleges used to set up.

A practical difficulty in the way of doing much but text-book work was clearly pointed out a year or two ago by Professor Macdonald. I refer to the absence of well-organized school libraries. This fact, discouraging at it may be, suggests not so much an abandonment of plans of collateral reading as an agreement upon a reasonable list from which the selections shall be drawn. If such an agreement should be reached the campaign to influence the expenditures of school boards for equipment could be intelligently carried on.

Such are some of the complications of the problem. In what I shall say about the proposed definition of the four fields of history I hope I may assume a conviction on our part that the secondary courses in history should aim to do something more than give to the pupil a grasp of facts supposedly essential; to be more specific, I hope we are agreed that these courses should include some training in the collection of facts, in the simpler methods of valuing testimony, as well as some practice in rapid reading of historical narratives and expositions. With this understanding I desire to urge that the definition go beyond the limits indicated in the questions sent out by the Committee on History. I hope the conference will authorize this committee to include in the definition not only the topics to be emphasized, those to be treated lightly, and those to be omitted, but also the necessary elements of supplementary work, with clear statements of method. Perhaps, several of these features

cannot readily be tested by examination. That is the problem of the College Entrance Board or of the entrance committees of the colleges. So long as history is treated almost wholly as an informational subject the undiscerning public will continue to suppose that it can be gotten up by some hurried cramming process or even by desultory reading. Most of us, I suppose, think that historical-mindedness is an accomplishment far more important than the memory of any particular body of facts. Now historical-mindedness must be the result either of wide reading of excellent historians or of a definite series of mental activities pursued habitually over a large part of the school period. A measure of it can be induced with a good text-book and a good teacher, principally the latter. But the good teacher will not become the rule until the leaders in the organization of history courses shall agree upon definite plans and accept no units which do not conform to them.

If the proposed definition contains simply the principal topics with a minimum requirement of collateral reading a step in advance will be taken. I am convinced, however, that we must accelerate the pace, that we should make a more inclusive definition, unless we are to be thrown on the defensive and see real history in many schools give place to a superficial study of current social and political problems. Suggestions in this direction are already coming from high quarters. In Cleveland our school system is being surveyed by educational experts under the management of the leading spirits of the Sage Foundation, and in the report on the curriculum a radical revision of the course in history is recommended. The work in history, it is declared, "should be developed on the basis of topics, a great abundance of reading being provided for each of the topics." Among the topics listed are "Race Problems," "Banks and Banking," "Strikes and Lockouts," "Crime," and the like. It is true that the report emphasizes the need of a suitable historical background with its time relations, but this presupposition is not as likely to prove attractive to the reformers who desire to free history from the trammels of chronology, and who say that the "lessons of history are absolutely independent of time." I find in the last "Texas History Teacher's Bulletin," apropos of an expected report of a committee of the National Education Association, the remark that "high school pupils of the future may study great movements and work out significant problems of history rather than attack the subject by arbitrary divisions." It would be easy to multiply quotations. If we do not move forward aggressively, we may soon be in the situation of those generals in the present war who are engaged chiefly in effecting strategic retreats to positions previously prepared in the rear.

It is easier to say what the general nature of the desired definition should be than to indicate its precise form and content. The suggestions contained in the reports of the Committee of Seven and of the Committee of Five are enlightening, but they are guiding principles and it is their exact application which we still lack. A new syllabus like that pre-

pared under the auspices of the New England History Teachers' Association will not meet the requirements. The teacher who most needs help cannot accept its recommendations as a sole guide. The range of references is too great. In many cases also there is little discrimination between readings suited to college use and those suited to the use of secondary pupils.

The definition should, I believe, be a concrete plan of work, rather than an exposition of principles or a syllabus of references. It should be so constructed that teachers can follow its directions from section to section of the course until it was completed. The existence of a definite plan, adapted to practical use, would guarantee its wide acceptance, especially if it was the product of the joint effort of leading committees. This would go far toward standardizing the subject.

I am not venturesome enough to attempt a detailed statement of what such a definition or plan of work should include. But I feel sure that certain elements should be found in it. In the first place, it should give a time distribution of the topics, so that the teacher would know how much ground is to be covered in the first month, how much in the second, etc. For illustrative purposes the minor topics should be indicated in a sufficient number of cases. In the second place, a reasonable minimum of tested reading should be given in connection with topics which lend themselves to such treatment. There are subjects the points of which are best brought out by a comparison of opinions or accounts. There are others upon which the statements in the text-book are literally texts and not explanations. But it is unnecessary to deal with all topics by this method. Such an effort would make the work impossible to control or test efficiently. A standard has to be established with reference to the conditions of the average school rather than the ideals of the exceptional school. If the readings were chosen from a brief list of the best books, the campaign to equip the schools with standard libraries in history would have some chances of success. In the third place, the course should include a few carefully graded exercises in ascertaining facts and in estimating roughly the value of different presentations of fact. This would not be research any more than a chemical experiment is research, but it would introduce the pupil to the simpler processes of disentangling the true from the false, just as the chemical experiment introduces him to the simpler methods of investigation in the mechanical sciences. There are now so many source books in each field that groups of selections upon the same topic can be utilized for the purpose of such exercises, although the plan might call into existence a source book for secondary schools composed solely of graded exercises. Other uses of source material such as Keatinge suggests may also be included in the plan.

I need not point out other desirable features, such as exercises in taking notes, geographical work, lists of selections for rapid reading, etc. We all realize the necessity of so organizing our work that the

pupils will be taught how to study. I fear the majority of them leave the secondary school with the notion that getting a history lesson is simply a matter of reading eight or ten pages in a half attentive fashion.

There is one aspect of the problem that I wish to discuss for a moment. The requirement which we are asked to define are those originally outlined by the Committee of Seven. The alternative course suggested more recently by the Committee of Five is not alluded to, for the reason, I suppose, that the College Entrance Board does not make out examination papers on that plan. There would be, however, some advantages in recognizing these newer divisions of the subject, by preparing a fuller definition of the fields indicated by the Committee of Five. Schools could take their choice between the two treatments especially of European history. Many schools are already inclined to adopt the newer distribution of emphasis. In some schools it may be a question of such courses or of a study of current topics. The existence of a choice would not interfere with the aim of standardizing the subject. If the method is graded and progressive, if its principal features are well established and enforced, that aim will be accomplished.

REMARKS BY MARGARET MCGILL, THE NEWTON HIGH SCHOOL, NEWTONVILLE, MASS.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE NEW ENGLAND HISTORY TEACHER IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS TOWARD THE DEFINITION OF HISTORY FIELDS.

The conditions under which history teachers work in New England secondary schools vary as widely as in the schools of the Middle States and South. Departmental work is the rule in the large city and suburban high schools, but there are very many of the smaller schools throughout New England where departmental work is not done and where conditions are such that it is impossible that it should be established. In these smaller schools, a Latin teacher must, perchance, take on history, the ancient language and the ancient history have some special affiliation in the minds of the arrangers of secondary school programs. We find even that more forced combination between mathematics and history. It is the old condition with which you are as familiar as we in New England, a condition existing and perpetuated because of the belief that since history is written for secondary schools in the English language and also conducted in that language in the history class-room any teacher may take it on as an extra subject if the appropriation for school purposes does not justify the employment of a specially trained history teacher.

Last fall, as has already been reported to you, a questionnaire was circulated among the members of the New England History Teachers' Association. The questions circulated dealt with the proposed definition of the history field. The answers of history teachers in secondary schools were of much interest.

The majority of those answering this series of questions were agreed that the proposed definition of

the content of history courses would be of much value. To whom would such a definition be of value? It was not one class of schools that voted its approval of this definition—not one kind of teacher. It was not the teacher in the large high school alone—where work is divided upon a departmental basis—not alone the teacher of several subjects in the small high school.

The well-trained, the experienced, the poorly equipped, the beginner—all united to increase the majority that thought favorably of the attempt to define, if possible, the content of the history courses in the secondary schools. If there is any marked dissent from this agreement in regard to the necessity of such definition, it is on the part of the teachers whose inexperience or lack of training prevents their appreciation of the task they have dared in undertaking to teach history in a secondary school.

Why do the well-trained teachers favor a definition of the field? They realize the difficulties of selection, of emphasis, of a proper balance between political, biographical, military, social and economic aspects. I cite military history wittingly, not because personally I want to teach the details of all, or of many military campaigns, but because there are some aspects of military that I am convinced cannot be wisely omitted.

The experienced teacher then wants definition because the fields are so vast that some guide-posts would help to relieve that uncertainty in regard to the correct road to take through a field in which one has not entire confidence in the guidance furnished by one's own personal survey. The experienced teacher wants definition also for the sake of the inexperienced assistants who come under her direction in any large departmental high school.

The introduction of an untried teacher into the problems of history teaching would be so much more satisfactory and effective if one could present her at the outset with some definition of those things that a majority of college and secondary school history teachers agreed it were wisest to teach.

Such a definition could be used as the basis of her work; such a basis to be considered as quite essential and absolutely required. With a fixed basis of required work her individual abilities will be in less danger of suffering a check in their development, and her work will not suffer but gain through the confidence that general agreement in regard to the line that her work should follow will give her.

The inexperienced teacher in a high school where she is without the guidance of another history teacher evidently needs this definition more than the teacher who is under the direction of one more experienced. If she adds poor training to her inexperience, how much more is she in need of such direction in her work as definition of the contents of the field would provide.

The text-book is not an infallible guide. Is there any text that does not need illumination, expansion, omissions? The text-book tells a continuous story. The essential topics must be removed from the environment of the text, then expanded, amplified, re-

arranged, and presented in such fashion that important men and events are emphasized. So many text-books black-type the headings of each paragraph, and thus establish such uniformity of emphasis that emphasis ceases and guidance by text headings is obscured by their overuse. The content of a text-book, then, however able the book, is not the complete guide for which both experienced and inexperienced history teachers are asking.

There is a certain class of "courageous" teachers, shall we say, in New England, I wonder if you have them also in the Middle States, who have undertaken to teach history without much training. Perhaps the training represented by one history course in high school and one more in college is the sum total of their formal training. In some known cases this is too high an estimate of the amount of formal preparation. Do not these aspirants need definition of history subject matter to show them that there is much definiteness in the demands made upon them as proposed teachers of history and they must not think that anybody can teach this subject in the secondary school just because its class-room work is conducted in English. This type of teacher in New England is more awake than ever before to the demands of such a subject as history, and some of these teachers are asking for help.

The desire for definition then in New England is expressed by the experienced and inexperienced, the well-trained, the self-trained, the over-courageous and those who are not now as self-confident as when they undertook this serious business of taking on the teaching of history subjects in connection with other quite unrelated work.

Some of our history teachers have deprecated the idea of definition lest it lead to the limitation of history teaching to the preparation for college examinations, and that thus the needs and rights of the non-college student will be obscured if not entirely submerged in those of the college-preparatory pupil. Others, and we are convinced that these constitute an important majority, are of the opinion that the results for those whom we call the "general student" will be only excellent.

Definiteness of idea in the mind of the history teacher, exactness of subject treatment will result in increased respect for and appreciation of the worth of a subject that also makes definite demands upon its students.

We have been visited in New England secondary schools with a wave of vocational and utilitarian ideas and practices. In this maze of chipping, filing, woodworking, blacksmithing, millinery, stenography, and typewriting, history needs to make its worthy demands upon the time and attention of the secondary school pupil as clear-cut as anyone of its competitors. The history courses would thus be recognized by both students, superintendent, school board and principals as knowing both what they have to offer and what equipment is needed to make their offering increasingly satisfactory to the teachers of the subject and to those students who either elect those courses or have them selected for them.

In New England secondary schools, then, there is a strong sentiment among many teachers of history in favor of such a definition of the content of history fields as would enable them to do better work. This better work to be made possible not only for the student preparing for a college examination, but also for that *general* student who takes history for its own sake.

This improvement will come because with better definition the subjects needs for specifically trained teachers, for library equipment, for maps, slides, pictures, will be appreciated both by the teachers undertaking to be history teachers and by those powers that select teachers and apportion school funds. The demand for the definition exists. The process and method of that definition remains to be determined.

REMARKS BY PROF. E. M. VIOLETTE, STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, KIRKVILLE, MO.

If a more precise definition of the history requirements means the drafting of a plan of work which will outline in considerable detail the most essential topics that should constitute the core of the various courses in history offered in our secondary schools, and which will also indicate how these topics may be dealt with so as to bring out clearly the meaning and the significance of the great movements that have taken place in the past, then I am in favor of such a definition. If it means nothing more than a bare enumeration of those phases or movements of history that should be followed out in the different courses, with some pious observations as to the superiority of developing the study of history in this manner, then I should not be in favor of it since I feel that it would not likely be of any special value and would not render the situation any better than it is now.

Assuming, then, that a more precise definition means what has been stated as the first alternative, let me submit my reasons for favoring it.

1. The process of delimiting the field of history in our secondary schools has been going on slowly but steadily for a good many years. Evidence of this is to be found by comparing the text-books that were in general use in the different fields of history throughout the country twenty to twenty-five years ago with the newer ones that have come into use in the last ten years or so. The former were characterized on the whole by a strictly chronological order of presenting the facts and by an attempt to give a little about a great many different topics, many of which were of minor importance. On the other hand, the newer books are marked by a decided tendency to get away from those things just mentioned that characterized the older ones and by a noticeable effort to give more and more attention to these matters that are closely related, and that are thought of as revealing the real significance of the period that may happen to be under consideration.

For example, in the text that was used twenty to twenty-five years ago in medieval and modern history, the chapter devoted to the Crusades was arranged so that each of the first four Crusades and the Chil-

dren's Crusade received special treatment, several pages being given to each one. On the other hand, in the most recent texts in medieval and modern history the subject of the Crusades has been dealt with in a way so that only the first one receives anything like a detailed treatment, while the others are dismissed with only one or two brief paragraphs.

Again, in the texts in American history that were popular twenty to twenty-five years ago such topics as John Eliot's Mission to the Indians, King Philip's War, the Salzburgers and the Wesleys in Georgia, the Conway Plot, the Black Hawk War, the Seminole Wars, the Crawford Act, Dorr's Rebellion and a great host of other topics like them were included, and sometimes were given as much space as others that were vastly more important. Now not only are such topics as these just named missing altogether in some of the latest texts in American history, but many others that appear in both the older and the newer texts are treated with a very different degree of emphasis. For example, a topic that had been given considerable attention in the older texts may be dealt with very slightly in the newer ones, or vice versa, according to its significance. Moreover, the newer texts often contain matter that had never been thought of by the authors of the older texts, and as an almost invariable rule this new matter contributes to the development of some great movement in history that had either been dealt with inadequately in the older texts or not at all.

Another noticeable thing in the newer American history texts is the abandonment of the scheme of dealing with the history of our own country by administrations exclusively and in a strictly chronological order. Take the Missouri Compromise, for example. In the older texts this subject always appeared in the chapter or section that dealt with Monroe's administration. But in one of the newer texts it is introduced into one of three chapters that are devoted to the subject of "Slavery and the West" which have been brought in after a study has been made of Van Buren's administration. In this way the Missouri Compromise has been given a new historical setting by definitely associating it with the movements affecting the expansion of slavery and the development of the west.

Other instances might be given of this sort of change in the treatment of the subject-matter not only in the text-books in medieval and modern history and in American history, but also in the other fields. But if our teaching experience reaches beyond ten years we are very familiar with them. The reason for recalling them to mind here is to point out that slowly but steadily the text-book writers have been delimiting the field of history, and that they will likely continue to do so. The question that rises in this connection is: Shall direction and acceleration be given by this Association to the delimitation that has been and is now going on, or shall it be left to the text-book writers to continue it in their own way and without any uniform standard? That brings me to my second reason for favoring the proposition before us.

2. Text-book writers are slow and cautious about making any great changes or innovations. For that they should not be taken to task too severely. They cannot play the role of reformer or innovator as they might often wish they could. The publishers attend to that, and for this we cannot find too great fault. But if there has been any improvement in the text-books in the last ten or fifteen years, it has been due in part at least to the fact that the authors who have written them have on their own responsibility largely been narrowing the field of history, and unless we feel that this process of delimitation should continue to come slowly and as individual writers will venture to carry it forward, I cannot see why we should oppose an attempt on the part of this Association to give an impetus to the movement that will hasten us on our way to the goal towards which we are slowly tending.

If this American Historical Association would undertake through a committee and a series of conferences to draft a plan of work that would set forth those topics that should constitute the core of the different courses in history, and would suggest methods of interpreting movements in history and of developing a scientific study of them, then a new order of text-books would be forthcoming almost at once. The readiness with which the publishers produced books that were constructed along the lines laid down by the Committees of Seven, Five and Eight of this Association as soon as their reports were out, is ground for believing that they will be ready to do the same thing if a committee should evolve some scheme that would give a fuller and a more precise definition of the courses in history in our secondary schools.

I am putting special emphasis upon this phase of the question because of the important part that the text-book plays in the typical secondary school. There may be a few secondary schools that eschew the text as an unmitigated evil and proceed without it, but to the great majority of the schools the text constitutes the foundation of the course in history, and unfortunately to many the superstructure also. Since, therefore, it follows that the level of the course in history in most of our secondary schools is determined by the text that is used, it behooves us to do all we can to encourage the making of the very best texts possible, and I feel that the drafting of a plan of work such as has been suggested will contribute materially to a great improvement in our text-books.

If there can be produced a new order of text-books based upon the idea here suggested, then I am sure that we shall have taken a step in the direction of solving another very perplexing problem, that of collateral reading. No live teacher of history is content to confine the work of his classes to what can be found in the texts. He believes heartily in extensive reading beyond the texts, and will put his students at it if there are any books available in the school library. But there is, I venture to say, no other problem in the teaching of history in our secondary schools so difficult of solution as that of how to get collateral reading done effectively. One reason why this is the case is that the information found in the

text-book on a given subject is generally so meagre that the student has very little in the way of a foundation of historical facts on which to build that which the books of reference offer him. As long as the text-books continue to be what they are now, notwithstanding the improvements that have been made in them in recent years, the gap between them and the books of reference will remain often too wide for the students to bridge over. But if the texts are constructed so that they develop in fuller outline than they do now the great movements in history and are stripped of the non-essential matter that is often retained as a kind of packing, then the students will find it possible to make much more extensive use of the books on the library shelves which to a large degree remain as yet unused or at least ineffectively used.

May I be pardoned if I seem to digress here long enough to add this word, namely, that I cannot hope that a full solution of this very difficult problem of collateral reading will be found altogether in a new order of text-books. The great difficulty in this problem is due to the character of the books that are placed upon our library shelves. The vast majority of them were never intended as books of reference for high school students, or for junior college students for that matter, and hence are not intelligently adapted to their uses or capabilities. I have been greatly astounded at the ignorance of the problems of secondary school history teaching on the part of those who have compiled lists of reference books for the use of secondary school students. In list after list that I have examined I have found the majority of the books totally unfitted for the use for which they were recommended. Time is not sufficient for me to develop this subject as I should like to, but I wish to express here this ardent hope that some time soon this Association will take up the problems of collateral reading and will bring its influence to bear upon the production of a new order of reference books in history. A new order of text-books will bring a greater number of the books in our libraries within the range of usefulness on the part of our secondary school students, but even with that change wrought, there will be a very large portion of the existing books that will remain as yet unusable and perhaps should remain so forever. What is needed is the production of books written by specialists, for the special and actual use of secondary school students as books of reference, and I trust the day is not far off when these sadly needed facilities will be forthcoming.

Let me suggest in conclusion some of the limitations that should be placed upon the plan of work that is contemplated.

In the first place, no scheme should be drawn up that is not flexible. It should be constructed so that certain parts could be used and certain other parts rejected by the teacher without doing any great violence to the scheme as a whole. Moreover, it should be arranged so as to admit of the introduction of certain topics that had not been included. This applies particularly to the courses in American history. More and more it is coming to be held by teachers

that the study of state and local history should be interwoven with the study of our own national history, especially so if the state or locality has a history that has had any sort of connection with that of the nation at large. In most of the states the study of state history is confined to the elementary schools, and there it is pursued as a separate subject. The futility of such procedure is coming to be recognized more and more, and the demand is beginning to be raised for the study of state history in our secondary schools in connection with American history. For that reason any scheme or plan of study that might be drawn up for secondary schools should leave an opportunity for the introduction of state and local history in connection with American history.

In the second place, a fuller definition of history should proceed by way of offering to the students a greater mass of essential facts that contribute to the developments of a number of well-selected topics, and not by way of setting forth a lot of generalizations or ready-made conclusions. Every teacher knows how prone students are to jump at conclusions or to generalize on insufficient data. Nothing should be done to encourage this tendency, but every effort should be made to deepen and broaden the students' knowledge of essential facts so that they may have a fair foundation on which they may base the conclusions that they may with some degree of safety draw.

In all that I have said, I have not been very much concerned in the matter of college entrance requirements. It matters not whether students are admitted to college by entrance examination or by certification; my chief interest in this question lies in the realm of secondary schools. Undoubtedly students will come to college better prepared in history if they have pursued courses in the secondary schools that have been arranged after a more precise definition of the history requirements, but their welfare should not be the determining factor in shaping up the courses in our secondary schools. It is because I believe that those who never go to college will be greatly benefited by a fuller and a more precise definition of history that I beg leave to place myself on record as in favor of it.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY DR. JAMES SULLIVAN, BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

In the first place, I wish to state that I believe that some attempt should be made to define the historical field in a different fashion from that in which it has been defined by the Committee of Seven, or in the syllabus of the New England History Teachers' Association. The former is too brief; the latter, too elaborate. The fields of history are in about the same condition that were the fields of physics and biology many years ago. You will recall that, in the early 80's, it was attempted to teach students of a high school the whole physical world. Well do I remember trying to study Ganot's Physics. In that book, it seemed that all the phenomena of the physical world were laid before the student for memorizing, even down to cloud formation. Professors Hall

and Bergen, seeing the futility of such a method of instruction, established their celebrated "Forty Experiments in Physics." Their attitude of mind was somewhat as follows: "It is clearly impossible to teach a high school student all of the phenomena of the physical world. Why not make a selection of forty things which they shall be called upon to know thoroughly well?" Is not this the attitude which we should take towards history?

I remember well the time that Mr. William Orr, then the principal of the Springfield High School, and now an Assistant Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, came to me and said, "The course of study in European history, which you have proposed for the New York State schools, is absurd. You used to give a year for Greek history and a year for Roman, and now you purpose to teach them all in the space of twelve weeks." I said in reply, "Mr. Orr, you teach biology in the first year of the high school. Do you mean to tell me that it is possible to cover the enormous field of biology in forty weeks, with all of the plants and the animals that exist in this world." "Oh," said he in reply, "we naturally make a very small selection of just the important plants and animals that we are going to study. We take certain of them as types." To which I replied, "Will you not give us credit for attempting to do the same thing in the Greek and Roman fields? We mean to select those things which the modern people have got from Greek and Roman civilization. We mean to take the attitude of Professor Mahaffy in his book entitled, 'What the Greeks Have Contributed to Modern Civilization.' In that work of his, he did not attempt to burden our minds with the details of how Brasidas got in and got out of the Island of Sphacteria, but touched on the contributions of the Greeks to our lives; and it was not necessary for him, in order to make these contributions clear, to go into all of the details of the Persian and Peloponnesian wars. And yet, we have had students for years studying the powers of the Greek archons and Roman aediles. . . . Now, all we ask you to let us do is that which you have done in your chosen field of biology."

Even if we laid the above enunciated principles at the basis of our decision to define the historical field, the question still is as to the form which this syllabus is to take. Personally, I am unalterably opposed to any detailed syllabus, such as has been already published by the New England History Teachers' Association, which is a most admirable piece of work. If we are going to do that sort of thing, we shall find that it is unnecessary, for it has already been done. What I think the teachers of the country wish and need is a few well-selected, large topics, corresponding in the physical field to the forty experiments in physics, and each one of these topics carefully given a point of view. For example, take the Crusades. I would place this topic in the syllabus. Then, underneath it, I would say this word to the teacher: "It is not expected that you are to teach all of the details in this great movement. Rather you should make clear the religious and political conditions in Europe which made possible the movement, define the atti-

tude of the church toward it; enumerate the causes leading up to it, and then take one Crusade, like the First or the Third, as a type. Into this Crusade, you may put the details, and then, after you have finished, you may say to the students, 'Seven or eight other Crusades, of much the same type, stretching at intervals over two centuries, took place. Into the details of these, we cannot go, because of the time at our disposal.' Then you should close the topic of the Crusades with a detailed statement as to the results which came from them." It is this point of view that the teacher needs rather than a syllabus of the Crusades. She can get a syllabus anywhere, but, unfortunately, the average teacher of history, even when well trained, does not seem to have the courage to omit the relatively unimportant. She feels that, because a thing appears in a syllabus or in a textbook, it must be taught. She has not the courage to teach the pupil the details of only one Crusade, and then say, "We shall not go into the others." She lacks this courage, because she is fearful that the examiners are going to compel her students to answer questions on the details of other Crusades. And I take it that it is the business of this committee to rid her of just that fear by stating to her that if she teaches this topic as indicated here, the questions will be so framed as not to call upon her pupils to answer all the petty details of the various Crusades.

To give another illustration. I will take the Growth of France. Here again, it is essential for the teacher to have a point of view. She should be told, and she should tell her pupils in turn that her object in teaching them about France is to show them how one of the great countries of the world to-day came to be what it is. She should be told this is in our so-called syllabus (which we call it for lack of a better name). She should be told to make clear to the students that France, like all of the other countries of Europe, was in the disorganized or loosely organized condition which accompanied feudalism, and that out of this somewhat confused condition France grew to be the most strongly centralized state in Europe. Then she should be told that, in order to bring out this growth, it is not necessary for her to give an account of the reigns of all the monarchs. She should rather be told to tell her pupils that any number of monarchs ruled over France, but that four or five stand out conspicuously as those who made France a strongly centralized and powerful state—Louis VI, Philip Augustus, Louis IX, Philip the Fair, Louis XI. Those after the time of Louis XI became so international in character as to receive treatment because of their European importance rather than because of their French. Having designated these five kings, she is then in a position to say, "We are going to study the doings of these men, because they are the men who made France, and we shall not even mention the numerous other kings who ruled between times the country of France, because they do not stand out prominently as organizers and as great kings."

What I have stated above with reference to our attitude towards France may also be applied to Eng-

land and to Germany, and the same principle of elimination may be used in all of our history.

In closing, I wish to lay before you an illustration which I have used before. Some years ago, I went to see the Harvard-Princeton football game, and on reading an account of it in Sunday's paper, I was struck with the historic genius of the reporter who wrote that account. I wish I had it by me at the present time to read it to you in full. I feel that the gentleman who wrote it would have made the best writer of history for secondary schools that we ever hit upon, and that he would have been a most excellent person to invite to this meeting to give his views as to how history should be presented to the students of our schools and colleges. He began his account by touching upon the plays which were successful and won the game. That was for the ordinary citizen who has to read as he runs. Into this account he did not put the plays that failed to work, but merely those that did work. When he had finished this most admirable statement, he then turned to a caption which read, "Details of the Game," and into that he put all the plays that were used by the two teams from start to finish, successful or unsuccessful. As I read that account, I said to myself, "There! that man has done what we ought to do." The ordinary run of boy and girl in school and college is studying history, not from the point of view of the historian, but from the point of view of the citizen who wishes to get those things in history which make him understand and appreciate the world in which he is living. The details of the game may be left for the professional historian. It should be the business of the latter, with his knowledge of the details, to lay before the ordinary citizen those high peaks in history which serve best to make the ordinary citizen a good one. It is to be lamented that our historians in the past have not exercised their judgment in picking out the important topics of history, but have been wont to throw into our text-books all of what I think I have properly called "the details of the game." The student in his turn, has tried to commit them all to memory, and, in doing so, has failed at the end to know what the "winning plays" were, because of the confusion of mind which has resulted in trying to get everything into his head.

Papers Presented at the Berkeley Meeting, July 22, 1915

The Eastern View

BY GEORGE L. BURR.

When in late May I had the temerity to accept Professor Cannon's invitation to open this discussion I counted on first learning much more than I then knew about "the Eastern view." But there fell upon me, as a bolt from the blue, an imperative call for another address, which drove me into seclusion till the university year was over and my time demanded by the journey to this coast. Already, however, I knew well the view of my colleagues at Cornell and that of many of our Eastern neighbors; I had heard the complaints

of the Eastern high school teachers; I had read the pleas of those in charge of the college board examinations; I had listened to the reformers who would claim more time for the very latest history. Perhaps, then, I may still presume to tell you something of the Eastern view.

Let me say, first of all, that I am in hearty sympathy with the wish of the secondary schools for a delimitation of the colleges' demands upon them. It is not alone that they may the better fit their pupils for the college entrance examinations. It is yet more that, by narrowing their work for the college examinations, they may gain time for work which seems to me more important than any likely to be tested by a college entrance examination. For I do not believe that the best things to be hoped from a secondary school training in history can well be tested by college examiners. We have tried it, and we have failed. We can test for mere knowledge, but beyond that we seem unable effectively to go. And let me hasten to add, for myself and my Cornell colleagues, that we have no wish to prescribe to the secondary schools their work. The great majority of their pupils will never go on to college at all; and it is for these, far more than those who go to college, that history is needed in the schools. We could often wish, indeed, that our students had not studied history before they come up to us. Even if they bring us no false or antiquated impressions, hard to overcome and likely to return and haunt them in later years, they come too often with enthusiasm dulled, and sometimes are alienated from history altogether. This is not strange; for, though I would have children fed with history from their babyhood, history as taught in college or in preparation for college is a very grown-up subject. Even after their entrance we are glad to have them defer it in the main, taking rather the languages they will later need in its study. If, nevertheless, we have placed history among our entrance requirements, it is only because the schools themselves have asked it, pleading that else it will be granted no place in their curriculum, even for those not bound for college, and that, if it cannot be used toward college entrance, their pupils will shun it. We bow therefore to the requirement; but, so far as we are free to act, we are glad to accept from the schools whatever training in history they find wisest for their pupils as a whole.

But have we no opinion as to what is there wisest? I suggest with hesitation, but I will not refuse to suggest. I have indeed already ventured suggestion, and can only summarize what I have elsewhere urged. I believe that the secondary schools should give their pupils such a general survey of history as shall all their lives serve them as a map of time, by which they may orient themselves in all their later thought and reading, locating in it every fresh accretion to their knowledge of the past and finding it a background to the lengthening vista of their lives. I believe, too, that, beyond this, the teacher of history in the secondary school should have the ability and the time to bring every pupil, however scantily or crudely, into first-hand touch with the sources of history, giving at

least a glimpse of the methods of research, at least a taste of historical thinking, at least a sense of historical detachment, and making history live for them and in them by the inspiration of fellow work, the kindling example of personality. And to this end I crave for the teacher a larger liberty, both as to field and as to method. Nor do I fail to share the views of those who would just now make history a better training for citizenship and life, especially for those who go straight from the schools into the world of work, by making it illumine the most recent past, the issues of the living present. And to this end, too, if it is to be achieved most fruitfully, with an eye to those liveliest questions which differ with the differing environment of every school, time must be gained by the delimitation of the colleges' prescribed demand.

Let us make that demand as definite, yet as flexible, as ever we can.

Would a Further Definition of the History Course be a Benefit to the Small High School?

BY CRYSTAL HARFORD.

The subject chosen for discussion at this session is one of interest to all teachers of history in the high schools. Of the vast field of human experience shall we select a certain portion and designate it as the content of a four years' study of history for the young people of to-day? The problem of the middle-sized and smaller school differs somewhat from that of the large city schools. In two respects I believe that such further limitation of the field of history study as has been proposed would be of special value to the smaller schools.

In the first place, the new and inexperienced teachers find their places in the smaller high school. In California these new teachers are not as a rule untrained and unprepared in their special branch, but often have had the same preparation in the universities and hold the same credentials as the teachers in the large schools. But they do lack experience. All who have taught remember how full of problems and perplexities those first years of teaching are, when plans and methods must be worked out and adjustment made to the school and the students. If then by such definition of the field we can relieve the new teacher of the further problem of what to teach, of where to lay stress, and what to omit entirely, we shall have conferred a real benefit. Few experienced teachers to-day, for instance, require of their students an exact knowledge of the events of the Peloponnesian War, yet the new teacher would find much space devoted to it in most of the text-books.

In the second place, there is not the opportunity in the smaller school for experimentation that is found in the large high school. The courses must be arranged for the benefit of the majority, and optional courses cannot be offered, because of the fact that one teacher must take charge of all of the history work and often some other branch as well. Hence the

course cannot be differentiated to meet the needs of those students who are planning a university course and perhaps wish to specialize in history, or of those who wish to get a general view of the field in a single year or two of study. As a rule, there is not even opportunity for a separate course in economics; but such knowledge of the subject as is gained must be included in the already crowded course in civics and United States history or perhaps in the work of debate, which many history teachers in the smaller schools carry on outside of school hours, at great expense of time and effort to themselves, usually unrecognized and unappreciated by the school officials, but bearing rich fruit in the additional knowledge and interest of their students. If then, from the field of experiment of the larger schools, with the advice of the distinguished authorities on the subject who comprise the American Historical Association, the field of study which is of most benefit to the majority can be selected, I believe a great help will be given the smaller school.

But such definition of the field should be, I believe, purely advisory in character. I should not favor such limitation if made by a board with power to compel its adoption, for the teacher in the small school, as well as the one in the larger, must be free to adapt the subject matter to the needs of the students and to the problems of the community. Such freedom is the essential condition of all good history teaching, but would not in any way be abridged by the recommendation of the American Historical Association.

But if agreement be made to further specify the course in history, the difficult problem still remains as to what shall be included, what eliminated. We have the facts, but as Macaulay says, "Facts are the mere dross of history. It is from the abstract truth which interprets them and lies latent among them like gold in the ore, that the mass derives its whole value." To-day, more than ever before, is there need that we take counsel as to the interpretation of history; for many of us feel that the ground is no longer sure under our feet. We have been accustomed to trace the growth of civilization as an essential part of history, yet to-day Europe is destroying that civilization which she has struggled through all the ages to achieve. We have led our students to see in the growth of national states a definite step in the progress of mankind, yet to-day that nationalism is turned into international hatred, and murder and massacre are the results. The problem of the teacher of history is a great one, as is also the opportunity if a true solution can be reached.

If the course of study is to be further defined, decision must be made as to what ages or periods shall be stressed as well as to what phases or subjects shall be emphasized. Here in California we are in a transition stage and there is no uniform course in history. Perhaps the majority of schools still follow the plan recommended by the Committee of Seven, but many others have adopted a two-year course in European history with various substitutes for the third year thus

omitted. The state university has recently liberalized its entrance requirements in history by accepting new combinations of United States history, civics, and economics. And so, here in California at least, the first step must be to standardize the course. If we accept the view that one of the chief aims of history study is to interpret the life of to-day, we would naturally emphasize those ages and those countries that have contributed most to our civilization. Thus we should devote more time to modern history, less to ancient; more stress would be given to English history, less to that of other countries; in American history we should emphasize the period since the Civil War even at the expense of that before the Revolutionary War.

Since modern life is so complex and varied, would it not be possible to trace a few definite lines of development through the ages, and thus give unity to the course? We should all agree, perhaps, as to the importance of the study of the growth of political and governmental functions, including the formation of the states of the world to-day. The present strife between France and Germany leads back to the division of the Frankish Empire of Charlemagne, and thence still further to the blending of the Teutonic wanderers with the old Romanized Celts, and thus to the influence of Rome itself. Such study of relationships helps to an understanding of recent developments in Europe, and an interest in current events is aroused, which may be developed at will. Or again, a study of the growth of such forms of government as have become permanent or have been stepping-stones to the present forms, as for instance, the English parliament or jury system, leads naturally to the study of the government of the United States and present-day politics, based on an understanding of the strength and weakness of other countries and movements.

A second field of interest is the industrial life of mankind, and here the work in history may be of vocational value by opening up to the student the realm of human activity. New interests may be aroused, or interests already awakened may be stimulated. The industrial revolution of the eighteenth century, for instance, is a great revelation to the boy of sixteen, and gives him a new insight into the meaning of our own age of machinery. Such study leads to an understanding of the economic problems of to-day; the commercial life of the sixteenth century gives background for the trade expansion and rivalry of the twentieth; the student comes to realize that the "lazy hobo," as he calls him, is a factor in a bigger problem as he reads of the mob at Rome crying for "bread and circus," or learns of the labor troubles of the boatmen on the River Nile at the dawn of history. Is it too much to expect that a broader outlook and a spirit of humanitarianism may result as the by-products of such studies?

A third great realm of thought is the intellectual. What time shall be given to the study of the development of language and literature? The students are unanimous in stating that history helps them in their

work in English, and I feel sure that unless we cooperate with the English teachers we shall miss a great opportunity. There are the fields of science, philosophy, education; our young folks never fail to be interested in the old Greek pedagogue, or the peripatetic philosophers with whom they have much in common, or the experiments and predictions of Roger Bacon which they see realized in the steamboat and flying machine of their own age. What attention shall be given to religion, that played so large a part in later Roman and medieval ages?

The problem then is threefold. First, shall we agree to further define the field of history? If so, what ages or countries shall receive greatest emphasis, and, thirdly, what realms or phases of civilization shall be stressed? While the problem is not an easy one to solve, it certainly is worth our thoughtful consideration.

The Content of the Two-Year Course in European History

BY EDWIN J. BERRINGER.

Under the old plan of four years of history in the high school we felt that we were not meeting the needs of the pupils. With so many studies being introduced into the curriculum we found that pupils were apt to take a year of ancient history and leave the subject there. Very often they took no more history at all; especially since the University of California has changed its admission requirements.

Our aim is to make the two years a unit and require pupils taking European history to complete it. Just how this will work out I am unable to tell, for the plan has been in operation but one year.

In the next place I believe that under the old plan too much time was taken up in studying those things of long ago which are almost out of the understanding, and certainly out of the experience of the child. It was a nicely arranged plan for pupils who intended going on to college and there taking up advanced work in history. But we must dismiss the idea that the grades are to prepare for the high schools, and the high schools in turn are to prepare for college. We must make each school a unit of preparation for life, complete in itself as nearly as may be.

The majority of our boys and girls do not go to the university, and we must give them a knowledge of present-day affairs, making them better fitted as citizens to enter into a social life founded upon democracy. For this reason the greatest stress must be laid upon the history of Europe since 1648.

I would not attempt to eliminate many of the things which go for culture, nor fail in endeavoring to train in correct historical method, but the attention must be directed toward the present. The time is past when we as American citizens can live our old stay-at-home kind of existence. We have entered into international affairs, and, unless we understand something more of modern Europe, we shall remain,

as a people, ignorant of many things it is vital that we should know.

Moreover the people as a whole have thought too little upon the economic and political conditions of the present, and have been blind to abuses in government. To be certain of this we need but review the history of the United States since 1865 and see what the voters have tolerated. Moreover, we have grown conceited in regard to our own country and become provincial in our views. We have failed to learn that there is a world across the Atlantic, rich in experience and progressive in policy. Many of the things which are new to the great body of American voters and considered experimental measures by them, have been in operation in European countries for some time. By making the course in European history a unit and occupying a shorter period of time in the whole course I believe that we shall get more pupils to take it, and, therefore, increase the number of citizens having a larger vision.

The criticism may be offered that by doing this we are using history as a background for social science studies and economics just as history was formerly taught as a background for the classics. It is not a just criticism, for we must take up more and more the economic interpretation of history and show how the institutions of to-day have been evolved and are still in process of evolution. The economic life is the thing of paramount importance where everyone has a voice in the government.

The great problem of the course is what to leave out altogether, what to touch lightly and what to emphasize. In the first place, no text-book is available which can be closely followed. Any that I have seen, so far, tends to condense the material heretofore used in the old text-books, thereby touching upon everything. The teacher should select certain things and let others go entirely. Too often a multitude of details are taught and the pupil has only a vague knowledge of isolated facts.

The first four weeks of work are bound either to create interest or transform the subject into a weary treadmill of topics to be recited. Too often the child is told to take so many pages and be prepared to recite them the following day. At the start little reading matter should be given to the child to study by himself. The teacher should tell the beginning chapters as a story. This is not to be confused with the lecture method. The stories we know best are those which were told us as children, therefore I believe this plan to be best suited to beginners in history. They may reproduce the story in note-books, for every pupil should be taught to keep one, but not the old-fashioned, formal type of note-book. It should be a collection of his efforts at reproduction, notes on his outside reading, and short written reports which he has made from time to time.

The teacher should select in the text certain things upon which the class may be called to recite and should teach them how to study these topics. Also certain references should be given to different members of the class to be read and reported upon, thus teaching them to pick out the important points and

to express themselves in good English. At the same time the memorizing habit, so often acquired in the grades, will be corrected.

Since we are to pass over the early period rapidly, great care must be taken to give the pupils a correct conception of the time element. Several days should be given to prehistoric man, the description of his life and the remains he has left.

From this point the transition is easy to the two great civilizations which grew up in the valley of the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates valley. To mention names of kings and dynasties is a useless task. The important thing is what they left to prove their civilization and what they contributed to those who came after them, such as the pyramids, the temples, the inscriptions, the Book of the Dead and the idea of the immortality of the soul, the calendar, and the Code of Hammurabi. Here we may pause to explain to some extent how history is written.

Show how the Empires first developed, then entered upon a period of conquest and finally declined, because they called the peasant workers from tilling the soil to join the army thereby creating an economic condition which is certain to cause the downfall of a nation if long continued.

The other eastern nations may be treated very briefly, bringing out two points especially, the strength of the Persian Empire and its contact with the Greeks; and the importance of the Hebrews under Solomon on account of the crossing of the trade routes.

This work should have occupied about three full weeks.

Greek history may be covered in five weeks. The first two or three days should take up study of the geography of the Mediterranean wherever the Greeks were found, and also its connection between the history already studied and the early Greeks. The excavations in Crete and the deciphering of inscriptions give the basis for teaching how history is written. This in connection with the stories of Troy furnishes a good illustration of the mingling of mythology and history and the difficulties in separating the false from the true. I am taking it for granted that English and history are correlated at this point in the study of the Odyssey, giving an opportunity to show how the Homeric songs were first handed down, until through trade the Greeks came into contact with the Phœnicians and learned the alphabet. In this connection time should be taken to contrast the polytheism of the Greeks with the monotheism of the Hebrews.

Next should be shown how the Greeks lived, their games, their athletic training, and their classes of society, when the middle class of merchants arose demanding a voice in the government. Early political institutions need not be dealt with to any extent more than to show the struggle of the classes and some of the reforms introduced.

The encroachments of the Persians may be touched lightly without going into any of the military events, showing how Athens came to the rescue and drove them back. It may seem too bad to omit Marathon and Miltiades, and perhaps leave the pupils still to be-

lieve that Marathon has to do only with a modern foot race, also to overlook the fame of Themistocles and Leonidas, but I believe that they will learn all this from their reading and will learn it better if they have a clear-cut historical foundation upon which to build.

The main point is to bring out the civilization of Imperial Athens in the Age of Pericles, to teach of her architecture whose columns are copied in the buildings about us, to show the perfection in sculpture which is copied to-day, and to treat of the drama which has been the lasting model of later classical plays; neither should we forget the achievements in science and mathematics, nor the work of the great teacher Socrates.

The fall of Athens is briefly told, as is also the rise to leadership and the failure of Sparta and Thebes. Some time should be given to the study of Spartan institutions and the rise of the science of government.

With the entrance of Philip of Macedon, and Alexander upon the scene, we take as a general heading, "The World Empire and the Divine Right of Kings." In including a period under such a heading as this, everything which does not bear upon it should be omitted. If this plan is followed in the work later on, much that is unnecessary may be eliminated. The events in gaining the territory in Alexander's Empire are not important to the beginner, but what constituted the Empire is. The personality of the man, the traditions which grew up about him are important to show how the empire rested upon him alone and how quickly at his death it dropped apart.

Roman history may be covered in six weeks. As in Greek history plenty of time should be given to the study of geography.

The Greek influence is the important thing in understanding the beginnings of Roman civilization. This done we may pause to look back at the method of development of nations as before taught, and then following the same method bring out the period of growth, the conquest of the peninsula, and finally world dominion; these together with the rise of the classes and the civil war are about the only subjects to be developed when dealing with the Republic, showing the economic problem between capital and labor brought on through the decay of the agricultural class and the employment of slave labor.

The period of the Empire should comprise the bulk of the work. It must be emphasized, for it will be useless to try to give any idea of the Napoleonic Empire without understanding the Empire of Rome. The idea of the Empire was to influence history for a long time. We need not deal with the Emperors aside from Augustus. In connection with him emphasize the Divine Right and absolute power of the King.

We must pause here to deal with Roman civilization. It is a good place to correlate the study of Latin with history. I have a set of interesting short papers written in this way, upon such subjects as the following: The Life of a Roman Boy, A Roman Banquet and What We Ate, Keeping House in Rome, The Life

of a Gladiator, The Waterworks in Rome, Roman Roads.

Four important topics remain to be dealt with near the end of the Empire; they are:

1. The decline of the army through the introduction of the Germans to keep up the numbers and the consequent weakness.

2. The triumph of Christianity.

3. The absolute government with its system of taxation and the disappearance of liberty and free citizenship.

4. The division of the Empire.

The fall of the Roman Empire may be passed over briefly. Important as it was, it is too confused to be understood by pupils at this time, and is therefore best passed over by simply showing how for years the tribes of the north had been filtering in and having land set apart for them within the borders of Rome, and finally resulting in the decline of Roman strength. Thus Rome fell an easy prey to the invaders. Omit the establishment of the kingdoms under Odoacer, Theodoric and others.

The last weeks of the term, probably four in number after taking out vacations, should be occupied with two general subjects. First. The Church, which should include the growth of Christianity, the growth of the power of the Bishop of Rome, and the establishment of the Church under Gregory the Great.

Second. The Empire. Charlemagne is a figure about whom the loose ends left from the fall of the Empire may be gathered together.

The idea of the World Church and the World Empire should be emphasized at the close of the term's work.

The work during the second semester must be centered about the Empire and the Church, their development, and decline, through the rise of nations and the Reformation. Constant reference to these points will unify the work and develop the power of tracing movements and pointing out the significance of an event in the movement. It does away with the habit of learning a mass of isolated facts.

The break-up of Charlemagne's Empire and the introduction of the feudal system mark a change in the economic system. Do not go into the details of the Feudal System, but show its general plan of organization. It is well to trace it down to the development of knighthood. The poetry and romance should be brought out, and this is well done in the English work where the pupils are reading *Ivanhoe*. Mark Twain's *Life of a Connecticut Yankee at the Court of King Arthur* should always supplement this part.

A number of short papers on such subjects as "My Life as a Serf," "How I Was Made a Knight," "Our Life in a Medieval Castle" give a touch of reality to the work.

The coming of the Norsemen and the later conquests of the Normans work into the scheme of Feudalism and Chivalry and serve as points of contact with the struggle between the Emperor and the Pope, for the Normans came to the support of the Pope. They also give what little is necessary for teaching the contact of England with the continent.

Gregory VII should be taken up as the central figure in the struggle for supremacy. All necessary information may be centered about him and the struggle defined. The resulting supremacy of the Church under Innocent III and the subsequent decline may be briefly told.

The crusades are important from two viewpoints: First, to show the influence of the Church over the minds of men and its temporal power over the princes; and second, the great economic factors which caused the princes to give their support to the Crusading spirit. To distinguish between the different Crusades more than to show that through the establishment of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem trade grew up, is a useless task. Two crusades may be mentioned toward the last, the Children's Crusade, to illustrate the blind religious faith of the people; and the capture of Constantinople, to show how the original purpose was lost sight of, and also to account for the later conquest of the city by the Turks.

The towns which developed as a result of the crusades must be studied. Life in the towns may be studied through reports on such subjects as "Going to Market," "Life of a Merchant," "A Visit to London."

The Renaissance follows. Show how the old order of things changed and the new appeared, emphasizing those things which point toward the Reformation.

The subject of the Reformation will necessitate some knowledge of England, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the German states. Here again we must take a backward look. Let it be from the standpoint of the break-up of the Empire. Leave out details. Some say teach things from the standpoint of English history if you are going to leave English history out of the junior year. We are teaching the history of Western Europe, and there is no meaning in such an expression. The great movements have no especially defined English viewpoint.

The Reformation is a movement of long duration, and should be traced from its earliest beginnings to 1648. By showing how it worked out in the different countries we are able to cover fairly well the main points in the history of the different countries. Other points should be left for the next year. Of course this period will include the Counter Reformation and the treaties of Westphalia. Omit the religious wars.

We now come to the second year. The first semester should extend to 1815.

The work groups itself about four main heads: The Divine Right of Kings and the revolt against it with a gradual working out of democratic ideas; the balance of power; the rise of nationality; and the industrial revolution and commercial expansion.

Keeping these main facts in mind and giving only such facts as bear upon them will eliminate much of the confusion.

A rapid glance backward at the unification of France and the coming of Louis XIV will give the starting-point. A review of England to the time of the Stuarts gives the situation there. The Dutch Declaration of Independence and the freeing of the Swiss are to be taken as the first examples of the

democratic spirit, which culminated in the Bill of Rights, the American and French Revolutions.

The next step is to dwell upon the spirit of reform which came into Europe at this time under the enlightened despots, but it came from above, a different matter from the gaining of reforms because of the demands of the people.

The coming of Prussia and Russia into Western European history must for a time interrupt our line of thought. Attention is fixed upon Frederick the Great and Peter of Russia. Special reports by pupils on the characters of this period will help to fix the facts in mind. Emphasize the expansion of these two countries, and the way is opened for the discussion of the idea of the balance of power. This will lead on to the expansion which caused the struggle of England and France in America as well as the activities of Spain and Portugal.

Now we come to the eve of the French Revolution when we may again take up the trend of events toward democracy in the demands made by the people, and in the philosophy of the times.

In teaching the Revolution we may divide it into three periods: the establishment of the constitutional monarchy; the abolition of monarchy and the establishment of the First Republic; and lastly, the foreign war. The details in these steps must be carefully selected, for the text-books generally tell too many facts. With the coming of Napoleon Bonaparte the French Revolution is lost sight of. We hark back to the old idea of Empire. Omit as far as possible campaigns and battles, but show where Napoleon added territory, and require a map showing his Empire at its greatest extent. Pause to review the idea of the Roman Empire, show how Napoleon was influenced by this and how he started in to play the enlightened despot. Show also how he disregarded the idea of nationality. There is no difficulty in getting the pupils to understand nationality, for we are met on every hand with intense nationalism here in our own country. Napoleon failed to recognize the power of this spirit, and because of it he was finally overthrown.

Most text-books give from one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty pages to this period, giving campaigns and battles. It is too much, and again we must select our material.

The Congress of Vienna is given too brief a treatment in most books. We must emphasize its work and the diplomacy of that great diplomat Talleyrand. Then, too, the books fail to show how the Congress disregarded nationality just as Napoleon had done, and how this was the cause of the subsequent revolutions.

Beginning before the French Revolution and continuing after it, came the industrial revolution. This should have equal weight with the political revolution, for its influence is felt in every home to the present day. Show how invention changed conditions, and point out some of the problems which it raised, such as child labor, women in the factories, and the capitalist class; also the rise of the socialist movement which has become a prominent factor in European

politics. No book as yet gives adequate treatment to this subject, and it will necessitate outside reading.

This should end the work of the semester.

The work of the second semester has for its beginning the working out of nationalism and democracy.

First it has to do with the revolutions following the Congress of Vienna and the attempts, successful and unsuccessful, of the Holy Alliance to suppress them.

The second step is the unification of Italy, the formation of the German Empire, the establishment of the Third Republic, and reforms in England. With these should be taken up the more recent events of history and some idea given of the manner in which these countries are governed and the share which the people take in the government. The agitation in Russia and Turkey for liberal government should be touched upon as well as the near Eastern question.

Recent colonial history is an important subject which should be dealt with in such a way as to show how it was influenced by over-population and desire for markets, thus bringing about certain conditions which bear upon the present war.

There should now be from five to six weeks left for dealing with present-day reforms and problems in the different countries, such as the socialist movement, the suffrage question, labor laws, unemployment, poverty, industrial legislation, taxation, and international law. In closing with these problems we give something on which to build when teaching our social subjects, also a field for illustration when we come to United States government.

The Report of the Committee of Seven in Relation to the Proposed Definition of the Course

BY JOHN R. SUTTON.

At the risk of seeming ultra conservative, I venture to answer the question under consideration in the negative. Previous to 1899 there was no approach to uniformity in the history courses given in our secondary schools. Furthermore, the schools that gave a four years' course in history were exceedingly few. But in that year the Committee of Seven made its famous report, and schools at once began to model their history courses after the Committee's scheme. The result is that now, sixteen years later, there is a fair degree of uniformity in the history work of the secondary schools of the United States, and a four years' course is the rule rather than the exception. In 1911, the Committee of Five made the tentative suggestion that English and Medieval European history be combined in the second year with emphasis on English history, and that the third year be devoted to modern history. Little attention has been paid to this suggestion, and thus to-day the four-year history courses in our secondary schools are based on the recommendations of the Committee of Seven.

Now, why should a new committee be appointed to send out to the history teachers of the nation a new

recommendation relative to the content of history courses? Such a recommendation would not make for greater uniformity. On the other hand, it would tend to destroy such uniformity as now exists; for some schools would follow the new recommendation, while others would abide by the old plan. The desire for a new committee and a new report grows out of dissatisfaction with certain features of the course as mapped out by the Committee of Seven. The changes advocated may be summed up in three statements:

1. That the course in history should cover three instead of four years, English history as a separate course being discontinued.

2. That the point of division between the first and the second year's work be moved along from the year 814 to 1600 or 1700 A. D.

3. That American colonial history be disposed of during the second year as a part of European history, leaving the third year for American history and government since 1760.

It is true that English history as a separate course is losing ground; not because English history lacks inherent value, but because so many other subjects—business courses, industrial courses, current English, current history, economics, etc.—have come into the curriculum to compete for the pupils' time. This competition is especially keen in the case of English history, because the majority of this wide range of electives is open, as is English history, only to third or fourth year pupils. But there are still some of our pupils, especially in the large schools, who want English history. I can think of no good reason why they should not have it. Of course, it cannot be made obligatory, but neither can ancient nor European history. Any attempt on the part of history teachers to make any of the history courses, other than American history and government, obligatory, is certain to meet with failure, on account of the new courses that have been recently admitted and of others that are knocking for admission. If by surrendering English history we could have a three years' course, *required of all for graduation*, the proposition would seem more attractive; but to surrender it without any compensation, when some pupils want it, seems uncalled for.

The one feature of the course outlined by the Committee of Seven which is meeting with the most persistent criticism in certain quarters is the division point—the year 814 A. D.—between the first and the second year's work. It is proposed to move this point of division to the middle of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century in order to gain more time for modern history. The proposition is so important, and to my mind so serious, that it should be considered with the utmost care and discussed with the utmost frankness. I admit the desirability of having more time for modern history, but considering the matter from all points of view, I prefer to retain the year 814 as the end of the first year's course.

In the first place, I assume that the first year's work is to be taken by first-year, or ninth-grade, pupils. As I have already stated, I do not believe

that ancient history or European history can ever be required for graduation—at least in our large city schools. These subjects must remain optional and must compete with other subjects. It would, therefore, be a serious thing for high school history not to begin with the ninth year. If left to the second year, after the interests of pupils have been established along other lines, the number of those electing history will be greatly diminished. The whole matter, therefore, reduces itself to the proposition of giving to pupils of the *ninth grade* a course in history from the earliest beginnings down to 1600 or 1700 A. D.

I do not need to dwell here upon the capabilities of boys and girls of fourteen and fifteen years of age. They are enthusiastic, willing to work, eager to learn. But their mental horizon is very limited; their understanding of human affairs is confined almost within the bounds of their own meager experience; their power to think logically is just beginning to dawn; and their ability to concentrate their minds upon any subject is so undeveloped that it is very difficult for them, by their own unaided efforts, to arrive at a clear understanding of the meaning of an ordinary paragraph in any of our text-books of history. The course as outlined by the Committee of Seven for the first year extends, in point of time, from the earliest beginnings—about 5000 B. C.—to the year 814 A. D. To appreciate merely the *passage* of that immense stretch of time requires the maturity of an adult, the mental training of a university graduate, and the imagination of a poet. But something can be done with boys and girls of fourteen and fifteen, if they are not required to hurry. By carefully selecting the parts that are to be emphasized and the parts that are to be more lightly treated, the ground to 814 A. D. can be covered in the first year with some degree of satisfaction. If, however, the whole medieval period of history were to be added to the year's work, I firmly believe that the result, from an educational point of view, would be disastrous—disastrous because it would put so much into the course that the whole purpose of the year's work would be defeated.

I believe that we will all agree that our business is not so much to teach history as to educate boys and girls. We use history as a valuable instrument in the process. If we make the instrument too cumbersome, we fail. You can't teach a five-year-old boy to mow grass with a scythe. A first-year pupil, who should be driven over a course in history extending to the end of the medieval period would emerge from the year's work with his head buzzing with vague notions. He would have gained no definite information as to the subject matter thus bolted, would have acquired no vital interest in history, would have formed no careful habits of study. In fact, the year's work would not further the process of his education in the slightest degree, for the hop-skip-and-jump method of disposing of huge masses of material can result in nothing but foggy ideas and slovenly habits—and these have no educative value.

Those who advocate the inclusion of the medieval period in the first year's work expect to be able to cover the ground by eliminating many items which are now regarded as of some importance; and we hear a good many depreciatory remarks about burdening our pupils' minds with such matters of detail as the reign of Rameses III, the ambitions of Nebuchadnezzar or Cyrus the Great, the reforms of Solon, the conquests of Alexander, or the love affair of Cleopatra or Henry VIII. Whatever one may think of this or that item as a topic appropriate for consideration in a secondary history course, the fact remains that Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia, the various Greek cities, Macedonia, and Rome, each had a continuous story, which takes its place as a part of the larger story of the ancient world. Here are certain facts, certain events leading to certain results, certain theories put into practice, certain great movements, rivalries, alliances, tragedies, advances toward righteousness, all blending together into a wonderful story. Men dispute as to many of the details, but not as to the main drift of the story. Any course in ancient history that does not make clear, insist upon, and take time to develop this main drift cannot be very effective in furthering the process of education. The mind acquires power when by a determined effort it incorporates any logically arranged body of knowledge; but when it is merely exposed to a great mass of material and is then hurried on to another mass without time to analyze, to arrange, to compare, to meditate, it acquires no strength from the experience, for it simply refuses to act. If one is dissatisfied with the selection of material found in the various text-books of ancient history, let him make his own selection; but let him remember that his selection must body forth the main drift of the story of the ancient world. That is independent of him and he cannot change it. Another thing which he must keep in mind is the immaturity of ninth-grade boys and girls. Still another fact is that education is a slow and steady growth, and that there is no royal road to it. Time must be allowed for these young people not only to comprehend the passage of seventy centuries, which in itself is a stupendous conception, but also to learn many names and facts—for there will be many names and facts no matter what the selection of material may be, and to arrange them into a complete whole.

The proposition of adding the medieval period to the first year's work seems to be based upon two assumptions; first, that the ancient and medieval periods of history are of little, if of any, importance, and are therefore to be disposed of as quickly and as painlessly as possible; and second, that modern history is, *per se*, both more interesting and more valuable than the story of the earlier periods. I do not wholly accept either of these assumptions. Since our business is to educate young boys and girls, we should teach no period of history simply to be rid of it, but should use each period as a valuable instrument in our work. That ancient and medieval history can thus be used, there can be no question. As

far as the element of interest is concerned—and it is an element of tremendous importance—any phase of history is as interesting to a class as the teacher is able to make it. Some teachers can arouse more interest in the struggle between the Egyptians and the Hittites than others can arouse in the French Revolution or the American Civil War. Interest in historic events does not depend so much upon their location in point of time as upon how they are used to make great national or international crises, with their accompanying human emotions, sympathies, and passions, live again.

There can be no doubt that the history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in that they immediately precede and lead up directly to the present, possesses a certain kind of importance that no former period has. But I firmly believe that the pupil who takes the two years' course with the year 814 as the dividing point will at the end of the course more deeply comprehend the *modern period* than the pupil who devotes his entire second year to the last two centuries after having skimmed lightly over the whole preceding stretch of centuries. The reason is that the one will come to a study of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with a fair understanding of the history of the preceding centuries, together with the mental power that comes from acquiring that understanding; while the other will come to the modern period with vague notions concerning earlier times and the unscholarly attitude which inevitably accompanies the acquisition of vague notions.

I am unwilling to admit that modern history is at every point more valuable to us than ancient or medieval history. Knowledge of the past may be said to be valuable in proportion as it helps us rightly to understand the present—although this of course is not the sole element of value. Ancient and medieval history abounds in lessons that greatly illuminate the problems of the present and of the recent past. The problem of political union or separation, as settled in different ways by the Greeks and by the Romans, with such far-reaching results, helps us to understand that same problem as applied to our own country. The controversy in Athens over the question of building a strong navy, the way it was decided, and the outcome, would doubtless be of value to us in our present controversy over the same question. Rome's "Monroe Doctrine" over Sicily and later over the balance of the Mediterranean world, and its final results, might give us some hint as to the importance of our own Monroe Doctrine. If the American people had had the patience to learn what ancient and medieval history has to teach respecting slavery and its final disappearance, our great Civil War might have been avoided. Our colonial system is in large measure based upon that of Rome. Rome has much to teach us, too, respecting the struggle between the classes that enjoy special privileges and those that do not. I do not question that modern history has much light to throw upon present-day problems—and that is its unique advantage—but the advice that comes to us from ancient and medieval times has one marked

advantage over what comes to us from the last two centuries; it is final. It comes with a period, not with a question mark; at the end of it; for sufficient time has elapsed to register the final results of policies, rivalries, social forces, and other elements that made up the life of those early times.

To my mind one of the most serious objections to carrying the first year's work beyond the year 814 is the fact that such a plan necessarily slights the history of Rome. The Roman Empire is the central point in the history of the world; for the attainments, the advances toward civilization, of all previous peoples, are appropriated by Rome and passed on to succeeding generations. From Rome as a starting-point, therefore, the history of the modern world begins, so that to the student of history all roads lead to Rome, figuratively, as they once did actually. It follows that any course in European history that does not take time to impress upon the minds of the pupils the tremendous significance of Rome is fundamentally wrong.

The nature of the period immediately following the death of Charlemagne furnishes another objection to including it in the first year's work. Down to the fifth century the civilized world has for many generations lived a settled, comparatively peaceful life. Then come three centuries of confusion and disorder caused by the German and the Mohammedan invasions. In the eighth century the Franks under the Carolingians bring order out of chaos. A class of young people following the progress of events feel that with Charlemagne they have once more reached solid ground, for again there is unity and comparative peace. Here it seems to me is the logical place to end the first year's work, for on beyond is another long period of confusion and disorder, unquestionably the most difficult period in the world's history to understand.

And now after all this argument relative to the subject-matter of the first- and second-year courses in history, permit me to state that in my opinion the acquirement of any given subject-matter by the pupil is not the sole end or aim of the course. Whether pupils spend a half-year or an entire year on the modern period, or any other period of history, the information which they acquire will speedily be forgotten. So true is this that if we teach history solely for the purpose of making it stick in the memory of the pupil, we all fail. Our real purpose is to give our pupils a deeper sympathy for humanity and a broader vision of life; to give them a surer grasp of present-day social, economic, and political problems; to develop in them the power to search intelligently for the truth relative to delicate and complicated human affairs, and to be able to distinguish between truth and near-truth; and finally to help them acquire such moral strength as will come from contemplating the successes and failures of men in the past—for the causes of these successes and failures drive home with unanswerable logic the truth of that great moral law that "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." If our work is well done, these things will

abide though the facts of history fade from the mind. Thus the proposition that ancient and medieval history be slighted in order to increase the time devoted to modern history on the theory that the facts of the more recent period are, per se, more useful to the student than those of former periods, is not valid; for the facts of any period, no matter how well learned, will soon be forgotten.

The suggestion that the colonial period of American history be taken care of as a part of the preceding course in modern history would doubtless meet with universal approval if modern history could be made a requirement for graduation. I do not believe that this can be done, and therefore I cannot see how the proposition can be entertained.

Finally, for the reasons which I have tried to make clear, I do not believe that any radical change in the history course as outlined by the Committee of Seven is advisable. Individual school systems should be encouraged to try such modifications of the course as seem wise to them. For example, I am strongly in favor of giving a year and a half to American History and Government. Those who feel so inclined may profitably try the experiment of adding the medieval period to the first year's work, or of making any other change that appeals to them. But I feel that a report of a national committee as to a revised course would be of little value until such experiments have led to some conclusions that are fairly definite and rather widely accepted.

To my mind a far more important question than that of revising the course of study in history is the question of *how best to use the subject-matter contained in the course*. The question of what should be the content of each year's work, I feel has been answered satisfactorily by the Committee of Seven, but it seems to me the problem of *aims and methods* has not received sufficient attention. I believe, therefore, that the American Historical Association would render a useful service to the teaching of history in secondary schools if they should appoint a committee which, accepting the courses as outlined by the Committee of Seven, should make detailed suggestions as to the aims and purposes of each year's work, and as to the methods to be used to attain those ends. Many teachers still proceed upon the assumption that the only purpose of any given day's work is to see that their pupils absorb the facts recorded on certain pages of the text-book.

Beyond this, what should they do? There is no time to enter into a discussion of this question now, but a definite detailed answer to it by a committee in which all history teachers could have confidence would constitute a report of first importance.

Prof. J. Holland Rose, in his article on "The National Idea" ("Contemporary Review" for March) argues that England's government has been too individualized for a crisis like the one it is facing, and for the present, at least, the idea of nationalism, dormant during the "piping days of peace and of unreal security," must be emphasized.

Periodical Literature

EDITED BY GERTRUDE BRAMLETTE RICHARDS, PH.D.

One of the most sweeping denunciations of the present administration is Elihu Root's "Our National Policy" in the "National Review" for April.

The "Revista d'Italia" for February, 1916, publishes "Il Proclama di Guerra all' Austria, in 1733" which is an excellent account of the preliminaries to the unification of Italy.

Events in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century are summarized in Prof. Paul Sickel's "Friedrich Hebbel as Politician and Patriot" ("Preussische Jahrbücher," February, 1916). In the article the background is of more importance to the average reader than is the subject himself.

The leading article in the current issue of "The Unpopular Review" is a defense of the administration plan for army increase by means of a Continental Army of Volunteers. Although the scheme proposed has been withdrawn, the article is still well worth the reading.

"What Will Happen to Poland," by T. J. Brennan, S.T.L. ("The Catholic World," May, 1916), is a brief but interesting sketch of conditions in Poland since the last partition.

"The Début of Emperor William by One Who Watched It" ("Blackwood's Magazine," April, 1916) is an interesting, rather gossipy, account of the Kaiser in the late '80's.

James Westfall Thompson's "The German Church and the Conversion of the Baltic Slavs" ("American Journal of Theology," April, 1916) is a careful treatment of religious conditions in the north of Europe in the eleventh century. The undeveloped monarchical institutions of the Baltic Slavs, their social structure, their political institutions all come in for their share of notice.

"The Political Theories of Calvinists Before the Puritan Exodus to America," by Herbert D. Foster ("American Historical Review" April, 1916), shows that Calvin himself advocated representative government "by common consent," and that his followers, after his death, "developed his theories, incorporated them into public law and proved them practicable."

"War as an Institution," by Bertrand Russell, grandson of Lord John Russell, and professor of mathematics at Cambridge, England ("Atlantic," May, 1916), is a defense of what he calls "one of the most permanent institutions of most free communities" which will, perhaps, appeal more to the philosopher than to the historian.

Ex-President William Howard Taft writes on "Great Britain's Bread Upon the Waters" in "The National Geographic Magazine" for March. The article is well illustrated, and is, moreover, a careful study of England's colonial policy.

Willard Huntington Wright's "The Conscience of Germany" ("Forum," May, 1916) is a justification of the ideals and activities of that country during the present war, as well as a rebuke to Americans who are unable to understand the German mind and outlook.

The sketch of "Catherine Gladstone," by her daughter ("Cornhill Magazine," April, 1916), is of interest to all who admire her husband, the great premier, giving as it does, glimpses of another side of his personality than that most generally emphasized by his biographers.

In "The Teachings of the Napoleonic War" ("Fortnightly Review," April), "Politicus" presents a careful analysis of the issues at stake in the early years of the nineteenth century, and traces their effect on posterity.

Gregory Mason's articles on Mexico, "Our Army of Education in Mexico" and "From the Inside Looking Out" ("Outlook," April 26 and May 10) are pleas for fair play in our attitude, mental and material, towards this harried country, as well as an insistence upon American citizens, now resident in Mexico, being accorded protection by our government.

"England's Secret Diplomacy," by H. M. Hyndman ("North American Review" for May), is a consideration of some of the historical operations of the foreign office since 1854.

The articles on the "Reorganization of the Empire" in the current number of "The Nineteenth Century" "The Australian View," by the Hon. B. R. Wise, and "The Coming of the Empire Cabinet," by Sidney Low, are most suggestive. The former advocates the union of the Empire "by the consent of the free peoples who compose the Empire," which consent is ascertained by an elective convention; and the second treats in more or less detail the attitude of the colonies toward the mother country during the war.

Reports from The Historical Field

NOTES.

"An Introduction to the Study of Pictures," by Prof. Robert E. Burke, of Indiana University, appears in the April, 1916, number of "Education" (Boston).

Prof. Frank H. Stephens, of the University of Missouri, has published in the Bulletin of the University (Volume 17, Number 5) a study of the Monroe Doctrine, tracing its origin and development, and particularly emphasizing recent interpretations of the Doctrine by Secretary Hay, President Roosevelt, President Taft, and President Wilson.

A sketch of the Department of History of the State of South Dakota, written by Doan Robinson, secretary and superintendent of the Department, appears in "The Pahasapa Quarterly" for April, 1916. The quarterly is published by the South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City, S. D.

The History Teachers' Club of the High Schools of Philadelphia met on Saturday, April 8, in the new building of the Germantown High School. The address of the day was delivered by Prof. Robert N. McElroy, of Princeton University, upon the subject, "The History Teachers and the War." The address led to considerable discussion, which was participated in by Mr. Homer Smith, Miss Jessie C. Evans, Miss Louise H. Haeseler, and others.

A pamphlet has recently been issued by the United States Bureau of Education upon the subject, "Professional Course for Service Among Immigrants." This course was prepared by the "Committee for Immigrants in America" (20 West Thirty-fourth Street, New York City). The course outlined a study of the field of immigration, the distribution of immigrants, immigration legislation, employment of immigrants, standards of living, education and

naturalization. It also tells of methods of work for aiding immigrants, and gives an outline of a series of lectures upon the subject.

The New York "Times" (April 29, 1916), in an editorial upon the use of the European war for teaching purposes, says: "The college or the school where discussion of the war is banned is a school or college conducted on utterly fallacious principles, is not giving decent or proper training to its students, and would better be shut up and abolished."

The April number of the "Catholic Historical Review" contains a study of "The Lost Province of Quivira," by the Rev. Michael Shine, in which an attempt is made to locate the Province of Quivira which was visited by Coronado in 1541. The location is placed in East Central Nebraska. Rev. Victor O'Daniel contributes a paper upon "Concanen's Election to the See of New York in 1808-1810." "The Attitude of Spain During the American Revolution" is treated by Dr. Charles H. McCarthy.

"The New Pan-Americanism" is the title of the most recent number (Volume 6, Number 1) of the pamphlets published by the World Peace Foundation. The pamphlet contains a review of the relations between the United States and the other American countries since March 12, 1913. It gives all the materials in relation to the A. B. C. Mediation respecting Mexico; papers bearing upon the Pan-American Union's attitude toward neutrality and Pan-American treaties for the advancement of peace.

Prof. Edgar Dawson, of Hunter College, New York City, has an interesting paper in "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science" for March, 1916, entitled, "The Invisible Government and Administrative Efficiency," in which he shows by a series of charts the present relationship of the electorate of New York State to the officers of the State, and also by similar charts the manner in which the officers of the State could be rearranged by appointment and choice so as to bring about greater efficiency.

The History and Government Bulletin of the Normal School at Kirksville, Mo., has reached its fourth issue. This number, dated January, 1916, contains five articles of much importance for the history teacher: "A High School Unit in Economics," by Superintendent S. E. Seaton, Macomb, Mo.; "Model of an Egyptian House," by J. L. Kingsbury; "Useful Metals in the Ancient World," by J. L. Kingsbury, giving references to the sources of supply of the principal metals and means for transporting them; "The Problem Method of Teaching History in the High School," by B. T. Johnson, and "The Historical Museum—How to Collect and Use One," by Prof. E. M. Violette.

"Education for Social Work" is the title of a recent bulletin issued by the United States Bureau of Education, and prepared by Miss Edith Abbott, of Hull House, Chicago. Miss Abbott shows that there are now five professional training schools for social workers in the United States. These are situated in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, Boston and St. Louis. The progress of this work has been aided by appropriations made by the trustees of the Sage Foundation which have resulted in the appointment of additional members of the faculty, the granting of scholarships or fellowships and a constant improvement in the quality of the work of the student body. The New York Schools of Philanthropy during the year 1909-10 received by bequest a fund which will ultimately amount to over a million dollars.

PATRIOTIC EDUCATION.

The relation of the school to the nation, particularly through the classes in civics, is discussed in No. 23 of "Teaching," published by the State Normal School at Emporia, Kan. (March 1, 1916). The papers presented in this number urge the rejection of the modern tendency of individualism in our schools, and substituting for it a more national spirit, which will really train pupils in the understanding of current national problems. Specific illustrations and type lessons for the conduct of classes in civics are given. The tendency of all is to create a greater respect for law, a more intelligent action upon local and national topics and the creation of every-day patriotism.

NORTHWESTERN ASSOCIATION.

The Northwestern Association of History, Government and Economic Teachers held its spring meeting in Spokane, Wash., on the 19th and 20th of April. The first session was a joint meeting with the Washington State Historical Society. The Hon. George Turner, of Spokane, presided, and the program was as follows: "Some Source Material for Northwestern History," Mr. T. C. Elliott, Walla Walla; "Old Spokane House and the Fur Traders," Mr. N. W. Durham, Spokane; "Flotsam and Jetsam on the Sands of Time," Rev. J. Neilson Barry, Spokane; "Work of the State Historical Society," Secretary W. P. Bonney, Tacoma.

The meeting on the 20th was presided over by President C. S. Kinston, president of the Association, and the following program was given: "The Open Door Policy," Prof. F. A. Golder, State College of Washington; "The Use of the War News in Schools," Prof. J. H. Underwood, University of Montana; Round Table, "How to Bring the Claims of History Instruction Before the Educational Authorities," led by Prof. Leroy F. Jackson, State College of Washington.

At the business session that followed the program, Prof. Jackson was appointed to head a committee of his choosing to formulate the aims of history teaching and bring them to the attention of educators and the public. The following officers were elected: President, Miss Adella Parker, Seattle; vice-president, Prof. H. L. Talkington, Lewiston, Idaho; secretary-treasurer, Prof. Leroy F. Jackson, State College of Washington.

TENNESSEE ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of the Tennessee History Teachers' Association was held at Nashville on April 20. The meeting was purely a formal one for the election of officers and transaction of business. After these matters were attended to, the meeting adjourned until Friday, April 21, when the association met in conference with the History Teachers' Section of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at the George Peabody College for Teachers. The officers for the ensuing year are: President, Dr. W. F. Russell, of the George Peabody College, Nashville; first vice-president, Mr. J. F. Zimmerman, of the West Tennessee State Normal School, Memphis; second vice-president, Mrs. C. W. Mitchell, of Columbia High School, Columbia; secretary-treasurer, Mr. Max Souby, of the Middle Tennessee State Normal School, Murfreesboro; additional members of the Executive Committee, Dr. St. George L. Sioussat, Vanderbilt University, Nashville; Miss Della Dortch, the Hume-Fogg High School, Nashville, and Prof. C. P. Patterson, West Tennessee State Normal School, Memphis.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA CONFERENCES.

Two conferences on history and social studies were held at the University of Pennsylvania in connection with Schoolmen's Week, April 12 to 15, 1916. The first conference, presided over by Prof. John B. McMaster, discussed some recent tendencies in teaching history. Prof. Edgar Dawson, of Hunter College, New York City, spoke from the topic, "The Fuller Definition of the History Requirement and Unity of the Course," and Prof. A. E. McKinley upon "The Doctrine of Interest and the Problem Method in History Teaching." The discussion was participated in by Mr. Smith Burnham, State Normal School, West Chester; Mr. Byron Hunsberger, Norristown High School; Mr. Harold A. Hallowell, Wilmington (Del.) High School; Mr. Homer Smith, West Philadelphia High School, and Mr. W. D. Renninger, Central High School, Philadelphia.

The second conference discussed the place of social studies in the fourth year of the high school. Prof. Frank D. Watson, of Haverford College, explained the nature and extent of such a course. Prof. James T. Young, of the University of Pennsylvania, discussed the problem method in the teaching of social sciences, and Prof. Clyde L. King advised that college entrance credit should be given for such a course.

MIDDLE STATES ANNUAL REPORT.

The most recent report (Number 13) of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland gives an account of the proceedings of meetings held in 1915, in Baltimore and Philadelphia. The papers printed include several upon the topic, "Recent Changes in the Teaching of History in the Middle States and Maryland;" another series of papers is upon the general topic, "The Differentiation of History in the High School from History in the Elementary Schools, and of History in the College from History in the High School, illustrated by References to the Causes of the American Revolution;" and still a third series discusses "The Content of the Course in European History in the Secondary Schools." In many ways the report is one of the most valuable ever issued by the Association. The membership list shows 327 members. Copies of the report can be obtained from the secretary, Prof. Edgar Dawson, Hunter College, New York City. (Price, 50 cents.)

CHICAGO CONFERENCE.

The twenty-eighth Educational Conference of Academies and High Schools in relations with the University of Chicago was held on Friday and Saturday, April 14 to 15. One section of the conference was devoted to the discussion of the subject of history and civics, at which the following program was presented: "Materials for Community Civics: How to Get Them and How to Use Them," by Byron S. Legg, High School, Mishawaka, Ind.; discussion led by Ethelwyn Charles, Marshall High School; "Civic Education in Secondary Schools," by Arthur W. Dunn, Special Civic Agent, Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.; "The Relation of High School to College Instruction in Civics," by Frederick D. Bramhall, University of Chicago; "The Interpretation of Modern Times as the Basis of the Selection of Topics in Ancient History," by E. J. Price, Jr., High School, Elgin, Ill.; discussion led by Lillian W. Thompson, Englewood High School; "The Need of Greater Emphasis on Modern European History," by Mattie B. Lacy, Oak Park and River Forest High School; discussion led by William A. Pease, Crane Technical High School; "Methods and Materials for Teaching Current History," by Alice E. Wadsworth, High School, Evanston, Ill.; discussion led by Joseph F. Morse, Hyde Park High School.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORY TEACHERS.

On Friday, April 28th, a joint session of the Teachers' Section of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the History Teachers' Association of Tennessee was held at the George Peabody College for Teachers; Mr. A. C. Thomas, State Superintendent of Education of Nebraska, presiding. Dr. Beverly W. Bond, Jr., of Purdue University, read a paper upon "American History and Civics in the Rural Schools," urging that the purpose of instruction in these subjects should be to promote the welfare of the rural community and to keep the country boys and girls at home. Mr. J. L. Kingsbury, of the State Normal School of Kirksville, favored a further definition of American history along the lines suggested by the committee of the American Historical Association. Prof. Max Souby, of the State Normal School, Murfreesboro, gave an address upon "Main Topics in American History for Emphasis in the Regular Class Room Work and Reasons for Their Selection" (this paper will be printed in the *MAGAZINE* in the near future). Prof. E. M. Violette, of the State Normal School of Kirksville, read a report upon "The Place of the Normal School in the Training of High School Teachers."

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

The ninth annual session of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held at Nashville, Tenn., April 27 to 29. Joint meetings were held with the Tennessee Historical Society, the Ohio Valley Historical Association, and the Tennessee History Teachers' Association. Dr. Dunbar Rowland, president of the Mississippi Historical Association, presided, and in the absence of Dr. Clarence S. Paine, who was ill, Dr. Beverley W. Bond, Jr., served as temporary secretary. The sessions included meetings at the Tennessee Historical Society, at Vanderbilt University, and at the George Peabody College for Teachers, in addition to those at the headquarters in the Hotel Hermitage.

A number of interesting and valuable papers were read, most of them relating to the history of the Mississippi Valley. Of especial interest was the presidential address by Dr. Dunbar Rowland on the "Place of the Mississippi Valley in American History." The papers presented covered a wide range of topics in connection with the history of the Valley. In time they extended from the early French explorations of the northwest down to the present situation in Mexico. In territory they covered almost all sections of the Valley from Alabama and Texas on the south to Minnesota on the north. In subject matter they ranged from religion as a factor in the early history of the Mississippi Valley to the function of military history, and among the personalities treated there were papers upon Jefferson Davis, Henry Clay and the Verendryes. A unique conference was held on Thursday, April 27, on the subject of State Centennial Celebrations, in which there participated representatives from the States of Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, Alabama, Missouri and Nebraska. At this conference Mr. J. W. Oliver, of the Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, read a paper upon "The Position of the Historian in the Observance of Statehood Centennials."

The social features of the meeting were notable and were typical of the hospitality for which Nashville is famous. Among them was a most delightful and instructive automobile trip to The Hermitage, the former home of Andrew Jackson.

Altogether the meeting was in every respect a most successful one. The attendance was large and representative of the Mississippi Valley, and the papers and reports preserved a uniformly high excellence. The following officers were elected:

For the Mississippi Valley Historical Association—President, Frederic L. Paxson; secretary-treasurer, Clarence S. Paine.

Members of the Executive Committee—For one year, St. George L. Sioussat; for two years, Edgar R. Harlan, Eugene M. Violette; for three years, C. W. Alvord, Archer B. Hulbert.

For the History Teachers' Section—Members of the committee, A. C. Thomas, Max Souby; chairman, A. C. Thomas; secretary, Howard C. Hill.

Dr. M. S. Quaife resigned as editor of the Proceedings, and this publication was placed in the hands of the editors of the "Review." To fill vacancies in the Board of Editors of the "Review," Professors Sioussat, Burpee, Buck and Cox were appointed.

MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION.

The fourteenth annual meeting of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland was held at Columbia University and Teachers' College, New York City, April 28 and 29, 1916. The program was a novel one and very interesting. The general topic of the first session was "What Profit Results from the Study of History." The replies to this came from a number of different sources. Prof. John H. Logan, of Rutgers College, gave the results of a questionnaire which he had sent out to a number of recent graduates who had taken work in history in some of the colleges of the district. The replies were overwhelmingly in favor of the college history course. Many of the graduates wrote that they now regretted they did not take more work in history.

The subject was continued from the standpoint of the specialist in transportation by Mr. Richard Warren Barrett, of the Lehigh Valley Railroad. Mr. Barrett said that the historical attitude of mind was one that was universally adopted by railroad lawyers and counsel in the preparation of cases for the courts and for the Interstate Commerce Commission. Further, he showed that all railway employees, from fireman to president, were continually making judgments and interpretations of the vast amount of legislation to which the railroads have been subjected. In recent years such interpretation almost invariably was based upon precedent—in other words, upon the historical point of view.

"History in the Life of the Man of Commerce" was discussed by Mr. Lincoln Cromwell, of William Islen and Co., who held that history for such a man was largely a matter of culture, profit, and entertainment for the leisure hours.

For the journalist, Mr. R. L. Davis, of the New York "Evening Post," held that there were two kinds of history. One, "Present History," which is the business of the journalist, and "Past History," which is the material of the historian. Mr. Davis believed that the journalist would benefit by a knowledge of past history and that his treatment of present events would be illuminated by such knowledge.

On the evening of April 28 an informal dinner and social evening was arranged at the Faculty Club of Columbia University. Dr. Albert E. McKinley read a paper upon "The War and European Schools."

On Saturday morning the topic for discussion was "A Fuller Recognition of Latin-America in History Teaching." The subject was excellently treated by Prof. William R. Shepherd, of Columbia University, who pointed out the ignorance of Latin-America upon the part of the ordinary American citizen. He urged a study of Spanish and Portuguese and the adoption of the study of Latin-American history. In the discussion which followed, Mr. A. S.

Beatman, head of the History Department of the Julia Richman High School, New York City, said that it was their plan to give a course in Spanish-American history to commercial students specializing in Spanish, covering a three or four year course, and beginning in September, 1916. Other speakers requested a bibliography of the subject, and urged the need of a satisfactory text-book on Spanish-American history for use in high schools and colleges.

Saturday, at noon, the members of the Association were the guests at lunch of Columbia University. In the afternoon a delightful yacht trip was taken around Manhattan Island, and dinner was had at the historic Fraunce's Tavern. The new officers of the Association elected at the business meeting are as follows: President, Miss Jessie C. Evans, William Penn High School, Philadelphia; vice-president, Prof. Marshall S. Brown, of New York University; secretary-treasurer, Prof. Livingston R. Schuyler, College of the City of New York; additional members of the Council, Miss Florence E. Stryker, State Normal School, Montclair, N. J., and Mr. E. S. Barnes, State Normal School, Geneseo, N. Y.

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION.

The annual spring meeting of the New England History Teachers' Association was held on Saturday, May 6, in the Massachusetts Historical Society Building, Boston. Committee reports were made upon methods of teaching and studying, and upon the teaching of economics. Prof. Frank M. Anderson, of Dartmouth College, read a paper on "The Changes which the European War Has Brought About in the Attitude of the Historian and the Teacher Toward the Recent History of Europe," and Dr. Samuel E. Morison, of Harvard University, showed how the traditional American point of view in international politics has been effected by the war and how this change is likely to be reflected by a different method of presentation of American history.

Luncheon was had at the Carlton Hotel, at which the guest of honor was Mr. George A. Plimpton. The officers of the association are: President, Philip P. Chase, Milton Academy; vice-president, Prof. Charles R. Lingley, Dartmouth College; secretary-treasurer, Horace Kidger, Newtonville, Mass., and additional members of the Council are Blanche Leavitt, of Newport, R. I.; Harriet E. Tuell, Somerville, Mass.; H. M. Varrell, Simmons College, Boston, and Prof. John O. Sumner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The association has recently issued a pamphlet, giving the names of officers, committees and members of the association, and describing the work which the association has done and which it contemplates doing. The membership list contains 350 names.

OHIO HISTORY TEACHERS' JOURNAL.

The first number of "The Ohio History Teachers' Journal," dated March, 1916, has appeared. The Journal is published by the Ohio History Teachers' Association. The aim of the paper is the improvement of the methods of teaching history and civics, and the development of a spirit of co-operation among the teachers of those studies throughout the State. The program for the Journal includes the advancement of the following plans: "An interchange of ideas concerning adequate history programs for our schools and the promotion of joint action on the part of college and high school teachers of history in introducing such programs where needed; the raising of standards both of preparation and performance for the history teacher; the encouragement of such teachers as find them-

selves isolated more or less from their fellow-workers and handicapped by the variety of subjects they are called upon to teach, as well as by inadequate library and school equipment; the development of a bond of union among the history teachers of the State by making possible an exchange of suggestions and questions; the publication of lists of books for high school libraries; the recommendation of useful equipment for history teaching; the furnishing of topics and references relating to the history of Ohio; and last, but not least, the publication of the proceedings of the association itself."

The present number contains a paper upon "The Evolution of the American Common School," by Dean F. P. Graves, of the School of Education of the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. E. J. Benton, of Western Reserve University, contributes a survey of past ideals and methods in the teaching of American history with suggestions for improvement in the methods from the elementary school to the college. In an article upon "Teaching Citizenship in the Public Schools," Mr. E. G. Pumphrey, of the Steele High School, Dayton, O., says: "To train a citizenship to be efficient, contented and economically independent is of stupendous primary value to the State; but to neglect a thorough grounding in the principles of citizenship is stupendous folly." The Historical and Archaeological Museum is described as a new tool in education by Samuel C. Derby, of Ohio State University. Other articles are "The Use of Aids to History Teaching in Ohio," by U. M. McCaughey, of the Central High School, Akron, O.; "How to Reach the Pupils in History Teaching," by Miss Frances Walsh, of the Normal School, Columbus, O.; "Justification for a Study of Ohio History in Our Schools," by Prof. C. L. Martzloff, of Ohio University, and "A Source Book on the National Aspects of Ohio History," by Mr. Homer C. Hockett, of Ohio State University.

CONSULTATION IN HISTORY.

Mention was made in the May number of the MAGAZINE that conferences for history teachers of New York State had been arranged by the State Department of Education, and that these conferences were under the direction of Mr. Avery W. Skinner, specialist in history of the State Department of Education. We have now a list of topics for discussion in these conferences, and are glad to publish them herewith.

1. The relative importance of social, industrial, political, military and religious phases of history. (To be discussed with reference to a particular field of history, for example, English history.)

2. General topics to be emphasized in each field of history.

3. The conduct of the history recitation.

4. The character and value of history tests (local).

5. How shall we use maps, globes and charts to the best advantage?

6. How shall we train pupils to organize material?

7. The kinds of source material and their use.

8. Collateral reading: (a) kinds; (b) purpose of assignment; (c) method of assignment; (d) testing; (e) reports.

9. What should a notebook contain?

10. The content of question papers in history.

11. The rating of history papers (with a comparison of some papers).

12. The importance of local history and how to arouse interest in it.

13. Excursions to historic sites or to museums (how and what to see).

14. The correlation of history with other subjects.

15. The use and abuse of aids to visualization.
 16. Desirable modifications in the history syllabus.
 17. How may we best teach the European background of American history?
 18. To what extent and by what method shall we teach the present European war?
 19. The use of periodical literature.
 20. How shall we revive an interest in the teaching of civics?
 21. Community civics and social science.
 22. Value of the biographical approach to history.
 23. The value of debates in their relation to English and to history.
 24. Should our teaching of history be made more definite and exact?
 25. Dramatization as a means of vivifying history.
 26. The "reportorial" method.
 27. Aims and methods of history teaching in the grades.
 28. Aims and methods of history teaching in the high schools.
 29. Special methods of teaching pupils to study history.
 30. How to teach current events.
 31. The mechanism of the recitation:
 - a. Waste of time in assignment of lessons.
 - b. Calling roll, etc.
 32. How shall clippings, illustrative material, etc., be classified and filed?
 - a. For teacher's use.
 - b. For pupil's use.
 33. The importance of the incorrect answer and how to handle it.

"The inexperienced teacher does not know what to do with it."

"The experienced teacher does not know what to do with the correct answer."
 34. Certain phases of American history which demand fuller treatment than that given in the average text; for example, the rise and fall of our merchant marine.
 35. Erroneous impressions gained from close adherence to the views set forth by one text.
 36. To what extent shall we treat history as a cultural subject and to what extent shall we treat it as an informational subject?
 37. What books on the methods of teaching history have you read within the past two years and which have you found most helpful?
- Please bring to the conference a list of the books you have found most helpful for students' collateral reading and for reference in each subject. Consider and classify this list as follows: (1) reference books; (2) books of an inspirational character; (3) books of an informational character; (4) source material.

GENEALOGICAL CHART.

The "Genealogical Chart of the Kings of England and Scotland," by Prof. Winifred Johnson, of the department of history, State Normal School, Cape Girardeau, Mo. (A. J. Nystrom & Co., Chicago), is one of the most complete and scholarly contributions to this phase of historical literature yet produced. The English lines, beginning with Egbert, and the Scotch, beginning with Malcolm II, are continued with more or less detail to the present time. The relationships existing between the various royal houses of Europe to-day are given in detail, and one is able to see at a glance the connections existing between the rulers of England, Italy, Russia, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Montenegro, Roumania, Greece, Germany, Austria, Holland, Serbia and Bulgaria, as well as the Bonapartes.

Another interesting feature is the genealogy of the Hanoverian kings, through the paternal line to Karl the Great. The intricate genealogies of the early Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors are given with remarkable clearness; the Hapsburg dynasty is traced to Maximilian I; the Holland rulers to William the Rich, Count of Dillenburg (the father of William the Silent); and the Hanoverian, again, to William the Silent. The Spanish and Savoyan houses with their network of intermarriages, are given a semblance of order.

Typographical aids are employed to enable one to follow a line directly through an apparent maze of broken line-ages. Despite the necessity of repetition of various names and lines, useless confusion has been carefully avoided, and characters of no historical importance are not dismissed with a mere mention.

The work as a whole is so admirably distinguished by scholarly accuracy and painstaking detail that it is difficult to do it justice in any recountal of its merits. Certainly it is a permanent contribution to historical literature, and is one that no amount of further investigation can alter or make obsolete. As such it is a necessity for teachers and students, not only of English, but of modern European history.

ANSWERS TO INQUIRIES.

Editor HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE: I write to ask for possible information concerning pictures illustrative of medieval and modern history suitable for use in a radiopticon. Having seen other bibliographies in your MAGAZINE, I thought probably you could aid me in this respect.

Answer. A Bibliography of Historical Pictures, Lantern Slides, etc., was published in the HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE for June, 1913, Volume 4, page 153.

Editor THE HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE: Can you aid me in securing information about the history and work of the Red Cross Society? N. B. DE B.

Answer. The following references are suggested:

"Under the Red Cross Flag at Home and Abroad," by Mabel T. Boardman, Philadelphia, 1915.

"The Origin of the Red Cross," translated from the French of H. Dunant, Philadelphia, 1911.

"The Life of Florence Nightingale," by Sir Edward Cook, London, 1913.

"A Story of the Red Cross," by Clara Barton, New York, 1904.

"Women's Work in America," by A. N. Myer, New York, 1891.

See also the articles upon the subject in the International Encyclopedia and the Encyclopedia Britannica, and in Bliss, Encyclopedia of Social Reform, as well as the several year books.

The American Red Cross Society (Washington, D. C.) publishes an illustrated monthly magazine and reports from time to time.

HISTORY TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS.

Additions to and corrections of the following list of associations are requested by the editor of the MAGAZINE.

Alabama History Teachers' Association, T. L. Grove, Tuscaloosa, Ala., member of Executive Council.

American Historical Association—Secretary, Waldo G. Leland, Washington, D. C.

History Section of Colorado State Teachers' Association—Chairman, Prof. C. C. Eckhardt, University of Colorado, Boulder, Col.

History Teachers' Association of Florida—President, Miss Caroline Brevard, Woman's College, Tallahassee; secretary, Miss E. M. Williams, Jacksonville.

Indiana History Teachers' Association—Secretary, Mrs. Osa Graham, Indianapolis, Ind.

Iowa Society of Social Science Teachers—President, Prof. L. B. Schmidt, Ames, Ia.; secretary, Miss Mary Kassan, East High School, Des Moines, Ia.

Jasper County, Mo., History Association—Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Peiffer, Carthage, Mo.

Kleio Club of University of Missouri.

Association of History Teachers of Middle States and Maryland—President, Miss Jessie C. Evans, William Penn High School, Philadelphia; secretary, Prof. L. R. Schuyler, City College, New York City.

Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Teachers' Section—Secretary, Howard C. Hill, State Normal School, Milwaukee, Wis.

Missouri Association of Teachers of History and Government—Secretary, Jesse E. Wrench, Columbia, Mo.

Nebraska History Teachers' Association—Secretary, Julia M. Wort, Lincoln, Neb.

New England History Teachers' Association—Secretary, Mr. Horace Kidger, 82 Madison Avenue, Newtonville, Mass.

New York City Conference—Chairman, Fred. H. Paine, East District High School, Brooklyn; secretary-treasurer, Miss Florence E. Stryker, State Normal School, Montclair, N. J.

Northwest Association of Teachers of History, Economics and Government—Secretary, Prof. L. T. Jackson, Pullman, Wash.

Ohio History Teachers' Association—Chairman, Wilbur H. Siebert, Ohio State University, Columbus; secretary, Miss A. P. Dickson, Dayton.

Political Science Club of students who have majored in history at Ohio State University.

South Dakota History Teachers' Association—Secretary, Edwin Ott, Sioux Falls, S. D.

Tennessee History Teachers' Association—Secretary-treasurer, Max Souby, Murfreesboro, Tenn.

Texas History Teachers' Section of the State Teachers' Association—Secretary, Prof. C. W. Ramsdell, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Twin City History Teachers' Association—Secretary, Miss Amanda Sundean, 2828 South Girard Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn., teacher in West High School.

Virginia History Teachers' Section of Virginia State Teachers' Association—President, Prof. J. W. Wayland, Harrisonburg, Va.; secretary, Katherine Wicker, Norfolk, Va.

HISTORY IN THE SUMMER SCHOOLS, 1916.

Information received too late for the May issue of the MAGAZINE.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

Baton Rouge, La., June 5 to August 4, 1916.

Professor Fleming and Doctor Stroud.

Modern European History. A Survey of European History Since 1715. Dr. Stroud.

History of Louisiana. Professor Fleming.

The French Revolution and Napoleon. Professor Fleming.

Current History, European and American. Professor Fleming.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE.

Orono, Maine, June 26 to August 4, 1916.

Professor Colvin.

United States History. A general survey from 1815.

European History.

English History. The history of England since 1715.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Chapel Hill, N. C., June 13 to July 28, 1916.

Mr. Vernon, Mr. Wagstaff, Mr. Hamilton.

The History of England. Mr. Vernon.

The History of the United States. Mr. Vernon.

History of Rome. Mr. Wagstaff.

The Reconstruction of the Union. A course in the history of the United States from 1865 to 1877. Mr. Hamilton.

Modern Europe. History of Europe from 1815 to the Present Time. Mr. Wagstaff.

Contemporary United States History. Mr. Hamilton.

Modern International Relations. Mr. Hamilton.

OHIO UNIVERSITY.

Athens, Ohio, June 24 to August 4, 1916.

Professor T. M. Morgan, Professor Hoover, Professor Martzoff, Assistant Professor Jones.

Economics. Professor Morgan.

European History. This course will be devoted to the period beginning with the Renaissance and the Dawn of Modern Civilization, covering the Thirty Years' War, the Protestant Reformation, and coming down to the French Revolution. Professor Morgan.

European History, II. The second course will cover the period from the French Revolution to the present time. Professor Morgan.

The British Empire. Professor Morgan.

American History, I. Covers the period to 1800. Professor Hoover.

American History, II. Covers the period from 1800 to the present time. Professor Hoover.

Methods in History. Professor Hoover.

Ohio History. Professor Martzoff.

United States History Review. Assistant Professor Jones.

General History, I. Embraces the period from the earliest written record to the Treaty of Verdun, 843 A. D. Assistant Professor Jones.

General History, II. Takes from the Treaty of Verdun to the present time. Assistant Professor Jones.

Civics. Assistant Professor Jones.

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON.

Pullman, Washington.

Professor Leroy F. Jackson.

American History, 1789-1830.

European History, 1789-1830.

Teaching of History.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY.

Morgantown, West Virginia, June 19 to August 19, 1916.

Professor John H. Latané, Professor J. M. Callahan, Professor O. P. Chitwood, Mr. Chester P. Higby.

Latin-American History and Diplomacy. Mr. Latané.

American Diplomacy and Foreign Policy: The United States as a World Power. Mr. Callahan.

International Law and Practice of Diplomacy. Mr. Callahan.

History of Rome. Mr. Chitwood.

Modern European History. Mr. Chitwood.

Continental Europe in the Nineteenth Century. Mr. Chitwood.

Landmarks of English History. Mr. Higby.

United States History and Civics for Teachers. Mr. Higby.

American Social and Economic History. Mr. Higby.

Antonio Slano's "Pan-American Misunderstandings" (April "Forum") is a discussion of the unsympathetic attitude of mind of the American and Latin-American toward each other.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY PROFESSOR WAYLAND J. CHASE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

CLEMENT, ERNEST WILSON. *A Short History of Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915. Pp. x, 190. \$1.00.

The author was for many years a resident of Japan as teacher, interpreter for the United States Legation, correspondent and editor, and has written two other books relating to this country. This little book is designed to quicken rather than to satisfy the reader's desire for knowledge of Japan's history, and is well furnished with references to works containing more details. It is a serviceable brief summary and makes a good preparation for a more extended study of the subject elsewhere.

CAHALL, RAYMOND DUBOIS. *The Sovereign Council of New France*. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Vol. LXV, No. 1. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1915. Pp. 274. \$2.25.

There has been no lack of interest among American scholars in the history of the western world in its age of colonial dependency. There has, however, been a radical change of emphasis. The older romantic school, Parkman, Prescott, Bancroft, made widely known the picturesque and dramatic in the story of the French, Spanish and English in America. The recent school has turned from the epic to place the emphasis upon the prosaic theme of institutional history. What colonial history has lost in the romantic it has gained in intensity and depth of knowledge. There have arisen within late years several groups of scholars, closely related and widely distributed, who have done most commendable work of a highly organized character to uncover, chart and publish new and vast stores of material and to broaden our knowledge of the political and administrative side of French, Spanish and English evolution in America. On the Atlantic the Andrews-Osgood school has brought into the light of day the institutional aspects of English colonial-imperial evolution. The California group has done much to trace the institutional history of the Spanish colonies. Professor Bolton's recent monograph on "Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century" deserves particular mention as a noteworthy contribution to Spanish colonial history and administration. The Canadian school has made large additions to the knowledge of local development in Canada under the French regime. It is within this class of intensive, critical, and copiously documented studies that falls Dr. Cahall's doctorate thesis on the Sovereign Council in Canada under the French control. There is no doubt of the author's diligent and wide examination and critical analysis of the sources, manuscript and printed, as attested by the abundant footnotes, careful bibliography and several appendixes.

The Sovereign Council was the chief governing body in New France, and its position and the lack of information concerning it are good and sufficient reasons for the existence of this study. The first three chapters are devoted to a detailed account of the relations of the chief personalities within the Council to each other. These relations were replete with friction as a result of the presence of three officials, the governor, the intendant, and the bishop, whose jurisdiction overlapped and who enjoyed much independence in position. But to single out for special treatment and to devote nearly one-half the volume to this aspect of conciliar history is to leave a distorted account of the body as a working organization. This part of the study might

have been very well worked into the remaining chapters on the organization, procedure, functions, and achievements. The latter chapters contain the most invaluable material, and as the author confesses are "the core of the work." And finally, as too often is the case with these local studies, the author has left out of account a treatment of the relation of the Council to the sovereign power in France.

It is a well written and painstaking study, and is welcomed by the serious student of colonial government.

W. T. ROOT.

The University of Wisconsin.

BECK, JAMES M. *The Evidence in the Case. A Discussion of the Moral Responsibility for the War of 1914, as Disclosed by the Diplomatic Records of England, Germany, Russia, France, Austria, Italy, and Belgium*. With an Introduction by Hon. Joseph H. Choate. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Revised edition, 1915. Pp. xxxv, 275. \$1.00, net.

This book is an amplification of an article printed in the New York "Times," October 25, 1914. Mr. Beck has studied the official documents published by the various nations at war, and from these as a basis he has made a very detailed and thorough argument as to the responsibility for the war. He expressly disclaims intention to discuss the underlying causes of the war, but limits himself to the diplomatic negotiations; to the question, "Who brought about the war in August, 1914?"

He makes much of the failure of Germany and Austria to give full statements of the communications which passed between them just previous to the outbreak of war. Then he gives a narrative account of the events, based on the documents, interrupting at one point to add new material derived from the official documents published by France. He concludes that Austria and Germany provoked the war, that Germany especially is guilty of not restraining Austria, and possibly even of instigating Austria, that there was no provocation for the invasion of Belgium by Germany, and that England, France, Italy, and Russia worked sincerely for the maintenance of peace. The book is well written and gives useful summaries of the facts. It may be used in connection with high school courses in recent European history, though its frank hostility to the German government may render it objectionable in some quarters.

CLARENCE PERKINS.

Ohio State University.

TICKNER, F. W. *Social and Industrial History of England*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1915. Pp. xii, 721. \$1.00.

Those high school teachers and general readers who are interested in the social and industrial side of English history will welcome this book. It is a continuous survey of this phase of English history, and is written in language within the comprehension of high school pupils. The work is presented in an attractive manner as some of the chapter headings indicate: "Life in an Early English Village," "A Medieval Town at Work," "A Medieval Town at Play," "Agricultural Progress at Last," "How Our Forefathers Were Governed," "How We Are Governed." On pages 383-385 the author drops into mere tabulation of facts which might be better in the form of a chronological table. However, this does not hold true of the book as a whole, which is well presented. The illustrations are not up to the standard of the narrative matter. There is a very good chronological table and a complete index.

C. A. SMITH.

University of Wisconsin.

WALLING, WILLIAM ENGLISH. *The Socialists and War. A Documentary Statement of the Position of the Socialists of All Countries; with Special Reference to Their Peace Policy.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1915. Pp. xii, 512. \$1.50, net.

As the title indicates, Mr. Walling has selected from the mass of statements made by leading socialists and the socialist press of different countries, a number which he regards as of the greatest political and economic importance. Three-fourths of the book is composed of such documents, and the editorial comment serves mainly to connect and explain the quotations. The book is divided into five parts: (1) The general position of the socialists on war and how they proposed to prevent war. (2) What they had done in the period immediately before the war. (3) The attitude of the leading socialists in various countries toward the war at its outbreak. (4) Socialist action and opinion during the war, classified by countries. (5) What the socialists are doing to end the war, their views of peace, and what the war has led the governments to do in the direction of State socialism.

Mr. Walling has made a remarkable compilation welded together by skilful editorial work. He states that "No material has been omitted or included merely because it seemed creditable or discreditable to socialists in general, or to the socialists of any particular country." The views expressed are quite diverse, and nearly always of great interest and suggestiveness. Whether or not one favors socialism, he must admit that most intelligent people the world over look to the socialist leaders for news of popular movements which may end the war. Mr. Walling gives us an excellent survey of their views, and suggests answers to many questions which thinking people have asked since the war began. The book is rather detailed and heavy for the average high school pupil, but it may be used to advantage by the more mature students of modern European history and economics.

CLARENCE PERKINS.

Ohio State University.

ASHLEY, ROSCOE LEWIS. *Ancient Civilization.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915. Pp. xxi, 363. \$1.10.

This text-book is written primarily to meet the demand for a half-year course in ancient history, extending from prehistoric man to 800 A. D., with emphasis on the civilization. For such a purpose the book furnishes a good basis. But since a skeleton of political history in a continuous narrative form has been included—and wisely so—it can be used for the ordinary year's work in ancient history.

The general make-up of the book maintains the excellent standard both of the publishers and of the author, who has written many text-books. There are numerous illustrations of a high order and abundant maps, both colored and in black and white. Besides topical headings and marginal notes in the text, each chapter is followed by lists of references, topics, studies and questions. The topics are more difficult than the studies. There are also comparative chronological tables at the close of certain periods. Perhaps the adjective *clear* best describes the appearance, the style and the contents of the book.

While teachers will notice that it is not the work of a specialist in ancient history, they will also note the many excellencies that are the results of the twofold experience of the author: first as a high school teacher, and second as a writer of many text-books in other historical fields. The references given are those that he has found usable in classes of ordinary high school pupils. The topics, studies,

questions and notes are the results of practical experience. He knows and understands the interests and capacity of pupils in secondary schools. VICTORIA A. ADAMS.
Calumet High School, Chicago.

ROBINSON, ALBERT G. *Cuba Old and New.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1915. Pp. 264.

The author of this work is a newspaper correspondent of reputation, known also as the author of "Cuba and the Intervention" (1905), probably the best narrative account of the first American intervention in Cuba. The present volume lacks the seriousness of the earlier work. It seems to have been written as a literary guide-book to Cuba, but no statement of such a purpose is made by the author. It contains abundant advice for the traveler, as well as a store of historical, political and economic information purveyed in a very popular style. Old Cuba and New Cuba, Old Havana and New Havana, the United States and Cuba, Cuba's Revolutions, Independence, Filibustering, are the titles of some of the chapters. The most interesting chapter is that giving details of filibustering expeditions in the period 1895 to 1898. M.

DODD, WILLIAM E. *Expansion and Conflict. The Riverside History of the United States, III.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1915. Pp. xii, 329, xxiv. \$1.25.

PAXSON, FREDERIC L. *The New Nation. The Riverside History, IV.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1915. Pp. xiv, 328. \$1.25.

Probably most of those who see this opinion will already have examined the books and formed their own judgments. In scope, they are uniquely comprehensive, presenting political conditions against a background of social, intellectual, emotional, and economic influences in a degree which no other book has attempted. The period covered is the most complex in our history, and each author is a recognized master of his sub-division of the field. Some chapters in each volume will be extremely useful reference reading for college classes. I shall be surprised, however, if they prove, as a whole, satisfactory text-books. Indeed, I am not sure that they are intended for text-books. Touching so many phases of our history as they do in such brief space, the impression they give is of a series of essays on history, rapid and allusive, assuming a knowledge that few college students possess, and hinting at connections and relations that few undergraduates have the insight to understand. It seems a pity that such breadth of plan, co-ordinating so many diverse elements of national development, had to be presented on so compressed a scale. A distinguishing feature of the books is their use of the census statistics on population and wealth, a source which in the past, historians have been too much inclined to leave to the economist. Frequent maps are introduced, especially in Professor Dodd's volume, to illustrate this material, which is used with telling effect in analyzing sectional differences and sociological tendencies. The main topics of United States history from Andrew Jackson to Woodrow Wilson are familiar to all who read this magazine. To enumerate them here would be an impertinence. These volumes discuss or allude to them all, and because of their comprehensive viewpoint will inevitably become useful and stimulating guides to further reading and study of the period, which, perhaps, may be their principal aim. The well chosen bibliographical notes at the end of each chapter make this easy even for the inexperienced reader. The dividing line between the volumes is the close of the Civil War. It is Professor Dodd's opinion, with which few

will disagree, that the United States did not become a nation until after the war; and Professor Paxson's that the new nation which has appeared since the war "has been only accidentally connected with that catastrophe." In broad outline this may be true, but in detail the theory would probably fail to account for some characteristic features of our national development.

EUGENE C. BARKER.

University of Texas.

BOOKS ON HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES FROM MARCH 25 TO APRIL 29, 1916.

LISTED BY CHARLES A. COULOMB, Ph.D.

Through a typographical error, the title of Dr. Herbert A. Gibbons' recent work was given in these columns last month as "The blackest page in modern history; events in America in 1915." The correct title is "The blackest page in modern history; events in Armenia in 1915."

American History.

- Adams, Charles J., compiler and editor. Quabaug, 1660-1910; an account of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration. Worcester, Mass.: Davis Press. 127 pp. \$1.00 net.
- Bayles, W. Harrison. Old taverns of New York. New York: F. Allaben Genoa. Co.: [30 E. 42d St.]. 505 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Burgess, John W. The administration of President Hayes. N. Y.: Scribner. 150 pp. \$1.00, net.
- De la Hunt, T. J. Perry County [Indiana], a history. Indianapolis: W. K. Stewart Co. 359 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Eckenrode, Hamilton J. The Revolution in Virginia. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin. 311 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Evjen, John O., Ph.D. Scandinavian Immigrants in New York, 1630-1674. With appendices on Scandinavians in Mexico and South America, 1532-40; Scandinavians in Canada, 1619-20; some Scandinavians in New York in the 18th century; German immigrants in New York, 1630-74. Illustrated. xxiv. 438 pp. Minneapolis, Minn.: K. K. Holter Publ. Co. \$2.50.
- Hawthorne, Julian, and Reynolds, F. J. The history of the United States from 1492 to 1915. In 3 vols. N. Y.: P. T. Collier & Son. \$2.25.
- Hoes, Mrs. Rose G. Catalogue of American historical costumes. Wash., D. C.: [The Author]. 76 pp. 50 cents.
- Johnson, Emory R., and others. History of the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States. In 2 vols. Wash., D. C.: Carnegie Inst. 363, 398 pp. \$6.00.
- Manning, William R. Early diplomatic relations between the United States and Mexico. Balto.: Johns Hopkins Press. 418 pp. \$2.25.
- Matthews, Franklin. Our navy in time of war (1861-1915). N. Y.: Appleton. 287 pp. 75 cents, net.
- Richard, Edouard. Acadie; reconstitution d'un chapitre perdu de l'histoire d'Amerique. In 3 vols. Boston: Marlier Pub. Co., 21-29 Harrison Ave. \$2.50.
- Roman, Charles V. American civilization and the negro. Phila.: F. A. Davis Co. 434 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Sabin, H., and Sabin, E. K. The making of Iowa. Chicago: Flanagan. 284 pp. 60 cents.
- Sams, Conway W. The conquest of Virginia. [An account of the Indians of Virginia.] N. Y.: Putnam. 432 pp. \$3.50, net.
- United States, Dept. of State. Affairs in Mexico. Message from the President of the United States [etc.]. Wash., D. C.: Govt. Pr. Off. 55 pp.
- Waterman, T. T. The delineation of the day-signs in the Aztec manuscripts. Berkeley, Cal.: Univ. of Cal. 297-398 pp. (4 pp. bibls.). \$1.00.

Ancient History.

- Bouchier, E. S. Syria as a Roman province. N. Y.: Longmans. 304 pp. \$2.00, net.

English History.

- Meyer, Arnold O. England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth. St. Louis: Herder. 555 pp. \$3.60, net.
- Schmitt, Bernadotte E. England and Germany, 1740-1914. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press. 524 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Strachey, Roy, and Strachey, Oliver. Keigwin's rebellion (1683-84), an episode in the history of Bombay. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 184 pp. \$2.50, net.

European History.

- Björkman, Edwin A., and others. Ukraine's claim to freedom. [Jersey City, N. J.: Ukrainian Natl. Asso.] 125 pp. (4 pp. bibls.). 50 cents.
- de Wesselitsky, G. Russia and democracy. N. Y.: Duffield. 96 pp. 75 cents, net.
- Ellis, E. S., and Keller, A. R., editors. History of the German people. In 16 vols. N. Y.: Internat. Hist. Soc., 171 Madison Ave. Each \$2.25.
- Fox, Frank. The Balkan peninsula. N. Y.: Macmillan. 213 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Marvin, Francis S., editor. The unity of Western civilization. N. Y.: Oxford University. 315 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Oak leaves; gleanings from German history. Vol. 1, No. 2. St. Louis: Herder. 10 cents.
- Pears, Sir Edwin. Forty years in Constantinople (1873-1915). N. Y.: Appleton. 390 pp. \$5.00, net.
- Stanoyevich, Milivoj S. Russian foreign policy in the East. Oakland, Cal.: Liberty Pub. Co. [1425 Alice St.]. 38 pp. (9 pp. bibls.). 50 cents.
- Young, Gen. Geo. F. East and West through fifteen centuries; being a general history from B.C. 44 to A.D. 1453. In 4 vols. Vols. 1 and 2, 44 B.C. to 740 A.D. N. Y.: Longmans. 612, 674 pp. \$12.00, net.

The War

- Aitken, Sir William M. Canada in Flanders. N. Y.: Doran. 245 pp. 50 cents, net.
- Baldwin, James M. France and the War. N. Y.: Appleton. 62 pp. 50 cents, net.
- Geouffre de Lapradelle, Albert, and Coudert, F. R., editors. War letters from France. N. Y.: Appleton. 107 pp. 50 cents, net.
- Germany. The Belgian people's war; a violation of international law; from the German white book. N. Y.: K. A. Fuehr. 135 pp.
- Hale, Walter. By motor to the firing line. N. Y.: Century Co. 283 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Halm, Karl. Der Freiheitskampf der Deutschen Nation. [Los Angeles, Cal.: German Austrian Defense.] 64 pp. 15 cents.
- Haw, George W., compiler and editor. War echoes; or Germany and Austria in the crisis. Chicago [Open Court]. 368 pp. \$1.25, net.
- Hugins, Roland. Germany misjudged. Chicago: Open Court. 111 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Labberton, J. H. Belgium and Germany. Chicago: Open Court. 153 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Morgan, John H. Leaves from a field notebook. [Personal narrative of European war.] N. Y.: Macmillan. 296 pp. \$1.50, net.
- O'Neill, Elizabeth. The war, 1915; a history and an explanation for boys and girls. N. Y.: Stokes. 86 pp. 60 cents, net.
- Protheroe, Ernest. . . . The life story of Edith Cavell. N. Y.: Abingdon Press. 170 pp. 40 cents, net.
- Robinson, William J. My fourteen months at the front. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 201 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Ruhl, Arthur. Antwerp to Gallipoli. N. Y.: Scribner. 304 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Washburn, Stanley. Victory in defeat; the agony of Warsaw and the Russian retreat. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Page. 180 pp. \$1.00, net.

Miscellaneous.

- Cincinnati: Chamber of Commerce. The citizens' book. Cin.: Stewart and Kidd. 242 pp. \$1.25, net.
 Cromer, Evelyn Baring, Earl of. Modern Egypt. In 2 vols. N. Y.: Macmillan. 594, 571 pp. \$2.50, net.
 Information annual, 1915. A continuous . . . digest of current events. N. Y.: R. R. Bowker & Co. 661 pp. \$4.00, net.
 Rockwell, Ethel T. Star-spangled banner pageant, staged in the Capitol Park at Madison, Wisconsin. Madison, Wis.: Board of Commerce. 39 pp. 10 cents.
 Russel, R. V. Tribes and castes of the central provinces of India. In 4 vols. N. Y.: Macmillan. \$14.00, net.

Biography.

- Adams, John Quincy. The writings of John Quincy Adams. In 12 vols. Vol. 6, 1816-1819. N. Y.: Macmillan. 573 pp. \$3.50, net.
 Coffin, Eliza W. A girl's life in Germantown. Boston: Sherman French. 72 pp. \$1.00, net.
 Ross, Estelle. Oliver Cromwell. N. Y.: Stokes. 192 pp. 75 cents, net.
 Richards, Laura E., and others. Julia Ward Howe, 1819-1910. In 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin. 392, 434 pp. \$4.00, net.
 Hyamson, Albert M. A dictionary of universal biography of all ages and of all peoples. N. Y.: Dutton. 744 pp. \$7.50 net.
 Rankin, H. B. Personal recollections of Abraham Lincoln. N. Y.: Putnam. 412 pp. \$2.00, net.
 Richards, John T. Abraham Lincoln, the lawyer-statesman. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin. 260 pp. \$2.50, net.
 Wheeler, Dan. E. Abraham Lincoln. N. Y.: Macmillan. 224 pp. 50 cents, net.
 Jerrold, Clare. The widowhood of Queen Victoria. N. Y.: Putnam. 454 pp. \$3.75, net.
 Seroggs, W. O. Filibusters and financiers, the story of William Walker and his associates. N. Y.: Macmillan. 408 pp. \$2.50, net.

- Mace, William H. Washington, a Virginia cavalier. Chicago: Rand McNally. 180 pp. 35 cents.
 Anderson, Mabel W. The life of General Stand Watie . . . of the Confederate Army. [Pryor, Okla., the author.] 58 pp. 55 cents.

Government and Politics.

- American Academy of Social and Political Science. Public administration and partizan politics. Phila.: The Academy. 273 pp. \$1.00.
 Burns, Cecil D. The morality of nations. N. Y.: Putnam. 254 pp. \$1.50, net.
 Daehne van Varick, August von, compiler. Documents respecting the limitation of armaments laid before the first Hague peace conference by the government of the Netherlands. Wash., D. C.: Carnegie Endow. for Internat. Peace. 32 pp.
 Haynes, F. E. Third party movements since the civil war. Iowa City, Ia.: Iowa State Hist. Soc. 564 pp. \$2.50.
 Hill, John P. The federal executive. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin. 269 pp. \$2.00, net.
 Johnson, Willis F. America's foreign relations. In 2 vols. N. Y.: Century Co. 551, 485 pp. \$6.00, net.
 Landon, S. W. A brief outline of the history and civil government of Vermont. Boston: Silver, Burdett. 101 pp. 42 cents.
 Larzelere, Claude S. The government of Michigan. Boston: Silver, Burdett. 152 pp. 40 cents.
 Lile, John G. The government of Arkansas. Columbus, O.: Champlin Press. 187 pp. 60 cents.
 McBain, Howard L. The law and the practice of municipal home rule. N. Y.: Lemeke & Beuchner. 724 pp. \$5.00, net.
 Mead, Lucia T. A., editor. The overthrow of the war system. Boston: Forum Publications. 137 pp. 75 cents.
 Sparks, Frank M. The business of government; municipal. Chicago: Rand McNally. 284 pp. \$1.25, net.
 United States, Bureau of Naturalization. An outline course in citizenship [etc.]. Wash., D. C.: Govt. Pr. Off. 28 pp.

Prepare Now for Your Fall Classes

You will need Notebooks, Outline Maps, Wall Maps, and other aids if your class-work in History is to continue up-to-date.

INVESTIGATE NOW

the merits of the MCKINLEY SERIES of Aids. They are used in the most progressive schools, public and private, and in the majority of colleges throughout the country. The MCKINLEY OUTLINE MAPS are widely used in college preparatory examinations; be sure your students are familiar with them. Many teachers are using the MCKINLEY PUBLICATIONS for school exhibitions; have you tried them?

IT WILL COST YOU BUT ONE CENT

A postal card request specifying the fields of history or geography in which you are interested will bring you a free set of samples.

MCKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

1619-1621 Ranstead Street

Philadelphia, Pa.